

The Review of English Studies

VOL. XVII.—No. 66

APRIL, 1941

GRUNDTVIG AS *BEOWULF* CRITIC

BY KEMP MALONE

The first and greatest of *Beowulf* scholars, as everybody knows, was N. F. S. Grundtvig. Only Thorkelin preceded him in the field, and Thorkelin, though he rescued the poem from oblivion, did it so badly that one can hardly call him a *Beowulf* scholar at all. Of the many scholars who have followed Grundtvig in the field, none can compare with him in genius or in importance of achievement. His reputation in Beowulfian studies, however, rests primarily on his identifications, the chief of these being the identification of Hygelac with the Chochilaicus of Gregory of Tours. His work as textual critic is also well known and duly esteemed. As a literary critic of *Beowulf*, however, he has received little attention. His views were ignored by most of his contemporaries, who preferred mythology and literary dissection, and in later times Beowulfian literary scholarship seems not merely to ignore but to be ignorant of his critical writings. Thus, Professor Tolkien, in his recent British Academy lecture, passes Grundtvig over in silence, although the problem which he discusses, and the conclusions which he reaches, may not unfairly be described as Grundtvig brought up to date. It seems evident that Tolkien's work is independent and original, and one must conclude that he was not familiar with Grundtvig's critical writings. In this he does not stand alone. Various reasons may be given for the neglect which has

befallen the great Danish critic. For one thing, he wrote in Danish, and though all Beowulfians ought to be at home in the Danish language, some of them are not. Moreover, most of Grundtvig's critical writings are buried in out-of-the-way publications, and many scholars, with the best will in the world, find his studies inaccessible. In the present paper I have tried to bring out the main features of Grundtvig's *Beowulf* criticism. The paper is based on the following studies, published by Grundtvig between the years 1817 and 1861:

Om Bjovulfs Drape, *Danne-Virke* II (1817), 207-289.

Bjovulfs Drape (Copenhagen, 1820), Introduction, pp. xxiii-lxxiv.

Bjovulfs Drape, *Brage og Idun* IV (1841), 481-538.

Beowulfs Beorh (Copenhagen, 1861), Introduction, pp. xv-lvii.

Of these, the first is the most important for our purposes. In it Grundtvig developed his theories at greater length than elsewhere, and we shall do well to examine this early study in some detail.

After some introductory pages of a personal nature, Grundtvig gives the plot of the poem (pp. 216-271). He begins his critical comments as follows (p. 271):¹

The last 13 fits, with the story of the dragon fight, are far from having the interest and the spiritual (poetic) unity of the first 28 fits about Grendel, and the poem cannot be called wholly unified. . . . When however we weigh everything well, we find that everything included in the poem hangs together admirably, at bottom. The weakness lies only in the complication, or, in other words, the poem is a spiritual whole the construction of which might have been more skilful. The eye saw true, but the hand made mistakes. In brief, we discover here, as in Shakespeare and, probably, in all English poetry, an effort at the systematic production of colossal works of art that can never succeed without what the English have always lacked; namely, taste. The poet's gaze was deep and wide. He wished to present, in a single picture, the life and activities of three great heroic families, the Scyldings, the Scilfings and the Wægmundings, in such a way that the Wægmundings were to stand preeminent as a war-tribe; indeed, one which feels its strength to the point of challenging the powers of darkness (by coming to the help of the Scyldings); one which is shaken by the Scilfings, and sinks before Nature's deepest, most poisonous monster [the dragon]. If the poet had either felt intensely or understood clearly his vision, the work would have ordered itself to a masterly whole. Perhaps he would have begun as he actually does, with the Scyldings, but he would not have forgotten them when their chains were broken, but would have let their lamentations be heard with Wiglaf's over Beowulf's body, and would have let their quickened tribe remind us that the hero

¹ Throughout this paper I have put Grundtvig's Danish into English, for the convenience of readers unfamiliar with the Danish language.

had not lived in vain. The poet would not have inserted the tale of the unhappy fate of the Hreðlings and the war with the Scilfings into the text in a manner so confused and broken up, and in places so unsuitable: in the middle of the dragon fight, in Wiglaf's lament, and in the sorrowful tidings of the hero's death. He would have let it come naturally, in part at the beginning, in part when the Geatas were introduced, and in part at Beowulf's accession to the throne. The conclusion, then, is that we have in this poem an epic outlook but no epic before us; we have all the letters, but they are not properly put together into a great picture-word. It will be seen that by *epos* I mean what the name indicates [i.e. "word"], and without raising the question at this time how far any poem actually exists that can be so called, it is enough for me that such a poem *can* exist, and that the present poem apparently tries to express what I mean by the epic name. The Word, as Holy Writ teaches, and as we now can grasp, is the highest and deepest expression for Life's revelation, and all history must be regarded as the Word's fight for victory. Now we see well enough that only the whole of history, seen in the light of truth, constitutes and expresses the true epic and heroic poem, but even as each individual man (however weakly and darkly) expresses and represents the race, even so every event with battle and victory undoubtedly expresses and represents (more or less plainly) the one great achievement in the stream of time which is accomplished among men [i.e. the victory of the Word]. If such a [particular] event is viewed spiritually, in the light of truth, it is quickened to a visible, concentrated picture of all history, and a poem which expresses such a view we can call an epic as justly as we call an offshoot of mankind a man. If it be asked how, in the light of this principle, those poems commonly called epics are to be judged, we need not answer here, but we may remark that such poems have always . . . been expected to represent an action which, regarded with the eye of a poet, can properly call for *general* concern or sympathy; in other words, the same thing, at bottom, as what was said above, for it is obvious that only that which portrays the whole can make an impression on all the parts.

Here Grundtvig pauses to discuss the *Iliad*, Tasso's *Jerusalem Delivered*, Klopstock's *Messias*, and the *Aeneid*. He finds them all markedly defective; the *Aeneid* particularly so. Indeed, he condemns the Vergilian work in toto, finding it 'a false and spurious epic in every respect' (p. 275). He then resumes as follows (p. 276):

Now I turn back to the island of the English. Here we find three great attempts to make epic poems; of these, two have tied themselves to the Bible, the third (which we have here before us) to the history of the North.

Before considering *Beowulf*, Grundtvig discusses briefly the two Biblical epics: Cædmon's paraphrase and Milton's *Paradise Lost*, but I shall have to omit this part of his essay.¹ He proceeds (p. 277):

¹ Elsewhere I am printing a study of Grundtvig's Milton criticism.

Finally we come to the present poem, and as the first attempt in Christendom to raise secular history to an epic, it deserves our special notice. Such an attempt in reality had no chance of success, since it called for a knowledge of history far from belonging to those days, called for an insight into the war between truth and falsehood not so easily to be found (though present well enough) in the events of heathen times. When therefore the poet undertook to put together heathen events into an epic, without turning himself into a heathen, he saw no other way than to fall back on tales of monsters, and thereby to set the events into a kind of relation to Christian truth. Therefore the stories about Grendel and the dragon make up the chief content of the poem, as a continuation of the devil's and the old giants' fight against God, a fight which, carried on by trolls and the like, interpenetrates the historical matter of the poem and is meant to give to this matter a higher meaning. It will be seen that the web is loose enough, and it is, besides, only half done, as the poet has neglected to link the two monster stories, and has made a mistake in giving the dragon some right on his side. But we see also that there is much more here than was to be expected. And we easily understand how the poet, with his eyes fixed upon his hero, . . . could readily suppose that everything bound to the hero was thereby bound together. . . . To what extent the poem as a whole has a right to (poetic) worth beyond its value for the historian of poetry, depends on whether there really *are* two parts in the great struggle [of mankind] bodied forth in the two monster fights, and one can hardly altogether deny that two such parts exist. Falsehood's hostility to truth shows itself . . . partly in history, partly in nature, and we cannot deny that the monster stories are embodiments of these, since Grendel represents the evil spirit of time, the dragon the evil spirit of nature. And that it truly costs man his earthly life to kill falsehood in nature (*miðgarðsorm*), for that, stronger warrant might well be given than the northern myth of *ragnarök*, although it is not uninteresting to note that this myth, too, points in that direction. But if the monster stories are not rooted and grounded, so to speak, in the historical matter which they are meant to carry and lift with them, their worth cannot be reckoned at a very high figure, whereas if they *are* so rooted and grounded, if we must find it reasonable that Denmark in a special way is linked to history and the land of the Geatas to nature, then the monster stories become temporary shadows, representations of that epic tale which the history of the North, seen in the light of truth, really makes, and then the poem as a whole receives a true mythical meaning. That is so, I think, and if I am right we forget the poet's weakness of hand in our admiration of his eye, which in twilight understood so well how to distinguish what even now the human reason is hardly able to separate and order.

Grundtvig continues with a discussion of the accuracy of the historical matter included in the poem. He reaches the highly sensible conclusion that (p. 281)

it would be equally unreasonable to reject the poem's historical matter

as mere invention, or to accept it as gospel truth, inasmuch as we may be sure it is neither the one nor the other.

Grundtvig also brings up two other matters, which he dismisses in a few words. He says (p. 288):

Perhaps I am expected, besides, to take up the question of the poem's purpose and date, but, as regards the author's intention, if I rightly understand the old poets, they had no other conscious purpose than to please themselves and others, while the date can hardly be determined more precisely than by pointing out that the poem was written in Saxon times and at a period when the harp was still in use and the Danes were still in favour; that is to say, undoubtedly before the eighth century was far advanced.

So much for Grundtvig's study of 1817. We turn now to his study of 1820, published as an introduction to his translation of *Beowulf*. Here I will confine myself to what Grundtvig has to say about the poetic worth of the Old-English poem. To quote (pp. xlix ff):

A detailed consideration of the old heroic poem would deal with the poem, in part, as a worthy memorial of the steady, highly poetical outlook on life characteristic of the Anglo-Saxons; it would deal with the poem, in part, as a work of art boldly laid out, beautifully expressed, and in many ways gloriously executed, but nevertheless half-miscarried if taken as a unit. Such a detailed consideration is not to be expected here, because I do not wish to make the door bigger than the house. . . . Here I will only say that in my opinion the poem deserves and requires such a detailed and thorough study. If I now add a few words, I do it in order that the reader . . . may see that I have something definite in mind. . . . I find the chief character, Beowulf, to be a hero looked at with a deep poetic gaze and made to come alive as the Northern hero of mankind, one who disarms the powers of darkness (at the cost of his own life in the end) and by his might saves his dying people. If I am right in this, then the poem towers, beyond question or dispute; it is indeed a Thorsdrapa which Iceland herself cannot match. I find, further, that Beowulf's monster-fights betoken the two great branches in the warfare which mankind wages against the powers of darkness. These powers express themselves partly in violent attack upon heroic life, and partly in a miserly hoarding of the weapons and treasure that go with the carrying on of that life. In other words, the powers of darkness appear partly in history, partly in nature. This alone is enough to give the poem a certain degree of poetic truth, which, in my eyes, is heightened to a true and noble historic outlook by the fact that the hero is a hero of the Goths; that is to say, of the northern heroic people *par excellence*; while the scene of the first or historic fight is Denmark, the northern fatherland of history, and the scene of the second fight, the fight with nature, is that Gothic kingdom which well may be called the seat of the northern natural powers.

Grundtvig's interpretation obviously depends upon an identification of the Geatas as a branch of the Goths, an identification commonly made in his own day, as in earlier times, and borne out by modern research, from which we learn that the Goths of history came originally from South Sweden, and that the Geatas were that branch of the Goths which stayed in the original home of the tribe.¹ When Grundtvig calls Denmark the northern fatherland of history, he has in mind the historic fact that the Danes were the leaders of Scandinavia from the time when our historical records begin down to the end of the Middle Ages at least. This leadership is reflected in the widespread use of the Danish name for the inhabitants and the language of Scandinavia as a whole, a use familiar to us from OE sources, but by no means confined to these.

Grundtvig concludes his discussion in the following terms (pp. li ff.):

From a poetic, a scientific or a historical point of view it would be equally sound to represent the Gothic hero as the friend of the Danish kings and the foe of the Swedish kings. And this brings us to my first reason for calling the poem half-mis-carried as a work of art. When monster-fights and history are blended as they are here, the inner unity is lost. My second reason is the want of outer unity, inasmuch as the fights with Grendel and the dragon are linked, indeed, but only through the person of the hero, who holds one in each hand, so to speak. My third stricture is this: that the episodes are for the most part without taste, and are often inserted in small bits, a procedure through which the poem loses in rounding and, to some degree, in clarity. These strictures of mine are hardly baseless, but nevertheless all informed persons will readily admit that one finds in certain parts of the poem much more true art than was to be expected in a work from a period unfamiliar with classical models, and I venture the opinion that *Beowulf* ought to be called a Gothic heroic poem, not only because its hero is a Goth, but also because it is a work of art in the same spirit and style as that type of art known as Gothic, for it is high and bold, carried through with ingenuity and loving care even in the smallest details, so that although the parts by no means blend as beautifully as in the works of the Greeks, each part in itself has far greater worth, and the whole is far more pregnant with meaning. The poet's style, finally, must be called excellent. The narrative is free and full, without the German prolixity, and without the cryptic brevity so often found in the poems of the Edda; it has the flowers of rhetoric without swarming with far-fetched comparisons like the later Icelandic verse. If one adds to this the poem's restraint, its warmth of feeling in many passages, and its religious fundamental tone, then one must avow that the poem in every way is a remarkable monument of olden times.

¹ See my edition of *Widsith* (London, 1936), p. 147, and the authorities there cited.

Before going on to Grundtvig's later studies, it will be well to analyse and evaluate his earlier criticism, as recorded in the studies just examined, those of 1817 and 1820. First let me point out the obvious fact that Grundtvig's criticism has its roots in the enlightenment of the eighteenth century, modified though it be by the romanticism of Grundtvig's own day. With these general features of Grundtvig's criticism I will not concern myself further in this paper. I will confine myself to the particular points which Grundtvig makes about *Beowulf*. He anticipates current critical views when he emphasizes the religious tone of the poem and when he takes it for granted that the poem was composed, not merely revised, by a Christian poet. As everybody knows, *Beowulf* was early annexed by specialists in Germanic antiquity, who disposed of its Christianity on the theory of extensive interpolation, and turned its hero into a heathen god or demi-god. Traces of this point of view are still to be found in some of our university courses of study, where *Beowulf* is put down under the head 'Old-English Heathen Poetry,' by way of contrast with the Christian poetry of Cædmon, Cynewulf and others. The orthodox current view rejects all this, properly enough, but in so doing it has simply returned to the interpretation made by Grundtvig in the beginnings of Beowulfian scholarship. Again, Grundtvig agrees with current critics when he proceeds on the presumption that the *Beowulf* poet was a conscious literary artist. To us as to Grundtvig this seems self-evident, but in the past many critics have tried to explain the poet's art without taking much account of conscious artistry. In particular, Grundtvig's penetrating comparison of the poem to an example of Gothic architecture has widely if not generally been ignored and the poet has been blamed because his work does not have the symmetry of a Greek temple.

Grundtvig's symbolic or representative interpretation of the monster-fights has recently been given renewed (and independent) expression, in a somewhat different form, by Professor Tolkien,¹ while the particular distinction which Grundtvig makes between Grendel and the dragon corresponds, somewhat, to that made in the following passage, taken from the introduction to Sedgfield's third edition of *Beowulf* (1935; p. xvi):

While Grendel and his mother as descendants of Cain and enemies of God rouse the hatred and invective of the poet, the fire-breathing dragon

¹ J. R. R. Tolkien, *Beowulf: The Monsters and the Critics*. Sir Israel Gollancz Memorial Lecture, British Academy, 1936.

is merely a natural phenomenon whose persecution of the people is no more worthy of special reprobation than is the lava stream which overwhelms the villages on the flanks of a volcano.

The local and temporal function of the monster-fights, however, so clearly brought out by Grundtvig, has received little if any notice since his day. It was the poet's intention to glorify the North; more specifically, to glorify a particular period in the history of the North. He accomplished this glorification through a hero who met and overcame, not merely human foes, but also, and chiefly, trolls and dragons, monstrous embodiments of the forces of evil, beings so formidable that only the greatest of heroes could possibly cope with them. But, as Grundtvig points out, a hero does not glorify his people and his era unless he and his deeds have organic connexion with that people and that era. The interpenetration of history and folktale, therefore, which is so marked a characteristic of the poem, is essential to the poet's purpose, and cannot properly be looked upon as a defect or flaw. In his study of 1817, Grundtvig makes the point clear enough, but in his study of 1820 he blames the poet for blending monster-fights with history. The inconsistency is perhaps to be explained on the theory that Grundtvig's criticism is itself a blend of discordant elements (neoclassic and romantic). Certainly his unfavourable criticism of the poem reflects, for the most part, characteristic weaknesses of neoclassic critical theory, and need not be taken too seriously today. Thus, we cannot agree with Grundtvig when he reproaches the poet for 'giving the dragon some right on his side'. It is interesting, however, to note that much of Grundtvig's unfavourable criticism of *Beowulf* sounds familiar enough, whether derived from him or not. The flaws or defects which he found in the poem are (with few exceptions) those which later critics also found. He seems to have been more influential in his false than in his true critical judgments.

In later studies Grundtvig develops his views by comparing the hero Beowulf with two other heroes famous in northern story: Sigurd and Starkad. He tells us, in his study of 1841 (pp. 491 ff.), that

Beowulf is not only marked by the fact that he combines the exploits of the other two (he saves Denmark [like Starkad] and slays a dragon [like Sigurd]) and adds something that they lack, namely, a valiant defense of his own country; he is also marked by his well nigh supernatural high-mindedness, his utter purity and his ascetic attitude towards the fair sex.

The first of these [combinations] reveals the author's poetic superiority; the second reveals the author's conscious art and English birth.

In his study of 1861 he works out somewhat differently a comparison between the OE poem and the *Völsungasaga*, neglecting though not ignoring his earlier comparison between the tale of Beowulf and the tale of Starkad. We read (pp. xxx ff.):

The *Beowulf* poet by no means contented himself with bringing together particular scenes taken from Scandinavian life in the heroic age. . . . He wove his Danish and Gothic saga-stuff so skilfully (if not tastefully) into his hero's glorious deeds of daring that Gothic hero-life as a whole, with its ragnarök, is mirrored in the English poem more fully and clearly by far than in the metrical chronicle of Starkad or in the tragedy of the *Völsungs*. . . . There are two heroic deeds by which the Gothic people especially have tested their powers. The first is the rousing of dormant heroism. The second is the vengeance wreaked upon a lawless greed that has taken by force the good things of the world. Heroism asleep is represented most clearly in the shape of a valkyria and greed is represented most clearly in the shape of a fire-dragon guarding a hoard. The tale of the *Völsungs* accordingly deals with the waking of a valkyria and the slaying of a dragon, but the tale was thrown into sad confusion by German romanticism, which, as we learn from the *Nibelungenlied*, has tried to shift the emphasis from the heroic deeds to the rivalry of the women (Brynhild and Kriemhild) over the hero. The OE poet is as bad as Shakespeare when it comes to artistry and taste, for with him (as in the Danish metrical chronicle) the sleeping valkyria is replaced by drunken, snoring hall-champions, and the hero's two fights (with the troll that puts the warriors to sleep and with the dragon that guards the hoard) lack all poetic connexion. Indeed, Beowulf . . . is made to fight both with Grendel and with Grendel's mother, and he gets only blame from the poet for his fatal fight with the dragon. But this champion poet boldly defies all strictures upon his work with his hawk's eye and lion's roar. While he lifts his Gothic hero to the clouds . . . and gives to his exploits their proper setting both historic and poetic, he sees well enough, nevertheless, that this Gothic hero of his, who wishes to anticipate Thor and slay the *miðgarðsorm* too early, has taken to trackless wilds and is wasting his matchless strength: he cannot wake heroism from its slumber, even in his own hall, nor yet can he save his people from destruction, so the dragon hoard is useless and must be buried again with him. . . . Such was the issue of the world-famous struggle of the Goths to wake the Northern valkyria at home and to snatch from the Roman dragon its plunder, and the English heroic poet had just as good reason to break all the rules of art as Offa had to burst his sark, and he has used his sword to as good purpose as Offa used Skrep and Beowulf the old sword of the giants, both of which, like his, were used up with the wielding.

Grundtvig's comparison of the careers of Beowulf and Sigurd (or Sigfrid) is ingenious but far-fetched, and can hardly be considered

an important contribution to Beowulfian criticism. I include it here for the sake of completeness. In general it may be said that the critical views of Grundtvig have more meat in them, for us, than have those of any other nineteenth-century student of the poem. His words are worth studying to-day, and will always have value; I, at least, have found them inspiring and illuminating.

McKERRROW'S 'PROLEGOMENA' RECONSIDERED

BY W. W. GREG

The volume of *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare*, in which McKerrow discussed the editorial principles and methods he proposed to follow in that work, was the last thing of any importance that he published. It is the outcome of much thought and experiment and represents his mature conclusions formed at the height of his powers. Probably it is the most weighty thing he wrote, and so far as I am aware it is the fullest and best discussion of the subject, from the point of view of the Elizabethan editor, that has been written. It is bound to be widely studied and to have a deep influence on the work of other editors. All the more important, therefore, that the theory and practice laid down in this volume should be subjected to the most rigorous scrutiny and criticism with the object of ascertaining whether they are calculated to yield the best possible results. I may say at once that though the work affords no indication of any failure of intellectual vigour, it does appear to me to show some signs of haste in a few curious slips, some want of correlation in the different parts, and perhaps some defect of analysis that more leisurely revision should have remedied. I have little doubt that through his anxiety to get the book finished and published before any further failure of health interfered with its production it suffered somewhat in form and possibly in content. I have dealt with certain minor points at the end of these notes. To begin with I want to consider carefully the principles he laid down for an editor's guidance.

From the discussion on pp. 6-18, headed 'The Basis of a Reprint', certain rules can be gathered, which I will give so far as possible in McKerrow's own words. In the first place the aim of an editor should be to produce a text that shall 'approach as closely as the extant material allows to a fair copy, made by the author himself, of his plays in the form which he intended finally to give them' (p. 6). For this purpose he should select as the basis of his reprint (as copy-text,

that is) the most 'authoritative' edition, this being 'that one of the early texts which, on a consideration of their genetic relationship, appears likely to have deviated to the smallest extent in all respects of wording, spelling, and punctuation from the author's manuscript' (pp. 7-8). Next a distinction is drawn between 'substantive' editions, namely, those not derived from any other extant edition, and 'derived' editions, namely, those derived, whether immediately or not, from other extant editions; and it is pointed out as evident that 'the "most authoritative text" of which we are in search must be a "substantive" one' (p. 8). The choice between 'substantive' texts, if there are more than one, is a matter for critical judgment (p. 14). But, having once selected his copy-text, an editor must 'reprint this as exactly as possible save for manifest and indubitable errors' (p. 7). To this only one exception is allowed, namely, if the editor is able to satisfy himself that some later 'derived' edition has been corrected by the author or by comparison with some authoritative source, in which case, while still following the copy-text (in matters of spelling, punctuation, and so forth), he 'must accept *all* the alterations of that [corrected] edition, saving any which seem obvious blunders or misprints', and not pick and choose among them (p. 18).

There can be no doubt, I think, as to the general soundness of these principles. In most cases their observance should suffice to produce a text as critically perfect as the material allows. Nevertheless, the conditions under which the dramatic works of the Elizabethan age have come down to us are so varied and complex (*cf.* p. 8) that it is almost impossible to lay down any proposition that shall be universally valid, and when the principles in question are more minutely examined, particularly when their application to individual cases is considered, they will be found to lose something both in definition and in cogency.

I will take first the matter of correction by the author. It is perhaps not particularly important, since it is not certain whether any case can be found among Shakespeare's plays, but since McKerrow saw fit to lay down a definite rule it is worth discussing. It may be relevant to remark that he had to deal with a case in point when printing *The Unfortunate Traveller* in his edition of Thomas Nashe. On that occasion he enunciated the same principle, declaring that once an editor has satisfied himself 'that these corrections, or some of them at least, are the work of the author, he has no choice but to make that [corrected] text the basis of his reprint' (*Nashe*, ii. 197).

Now, there seems no reason to doubt McKerrow's conclusion that Nashe himself corrected the second edition of *The Unfortunate Traveller*; but he also pointed out that on one page alterations appear to have been made with the purely typographical object of compressing the matter into the end of a sheet, while others elsewhere 'seem to be the work of some person who had not thoroughly considered the sense of the passage which he was altering' (ii. 195). It seems unreasonable to make the author responsible for changes such as these. Now, the point I want to bring out is this, that it is only a consideration of the alterations themselves that can lead to the judgment that some of them are due to the author (thus confirming the claim of the edition to be 'Newly corrected and augmented') and that the same consideration shows that other alterations presumably come from some other source—while an editor is in any case bound to discriminate as best he can between what are intentional changes and what are accidental. I can therefore see no sufficient ground for relying on the critical judgment in the one case rather than the other, and am led to doubt whether the rule that if *some* alterations in a particular edition can be shown to be authoritative, *all* alterations in that edition must necessarily be accepted, is calculated to produce the best critical text—whether indeed it is not rather an abdication of the editorial function.

Difficulty next arises over the distinction, plain enough at first sight, between 'substantive' and 'derived' editions, for it is not clear whether the expression 'derived from' means simply 'printed from' (or 'derived by successive printings from') or whether it has some more subtle meaning. McKerrow was aware, of course, that the distinction is in some degree quantitative, for he points out in a footnote on pp. 10–11 that a text that is in the main 'substantive' may yet contain individual passages borrowed from an extant source (e.g. 2 and 3 *Henry VI* in F), while a text that is in the main 'derived' may yet contain original insertions (e.g. *Richard II*, Q 1608, and *Titus Andronicus*, F). But the matter is in fact much more complicated than this, and it is surprising that McKerrow should not have realized that the distinction needed further elucidation, seeing that several of his illustrative quotations as well as his two specimen pages are drawn from *Richard III*, which is a case in point. In this play the Folio text was printed mainly from the Quarto of 1622 with corrections, partly from that of 1602 without corrections (see the note prefixed to the specimen pages). It is, therefore, obviously in some

sense a 'derived' text. At the same time, the corrections are so numerous and important, and apparently drawn from so superior a source, as profoundly to change the character of the text and to render the Folio by far the more authoritative. McKerrow naturally chose it for his copy-text, thereby proving that he regarded it as 'substantive'. It follows that an edition is to be classed as 'substantive' or not in respect to its general character rather than the 'copy' used in its production, and it would have been well if McKerrow had discussed the matter more fully, since the distinction is in fact much less simple than he has made it appear. As it is, one may suspect that he was not quite clear about it in his own mind: he even appears to have hesitated over the text of *Richard III*, for in the note prefixed to the specimen pages he writes: 'While a case could, I think, be made out either for using the First Quarto corrected by the Folio, or for using the Folio alone, as the basis of a reprint, the latter has been here preferred as giving a somewhat more uniform text.'

Now, just as the same considerations that show some corrections to be due to the author may at the same time show that other alterations cannot be his, so in the case of what one might call 'mixed' texts, such as *Richard III* and *King Lear*, or indeed whenever there is more than one 'substantive' edition, the same analysis that shows one text to be *on the whole* the more authoritative, may equally show its inferiority in *some particular respect*. Thus there is no doubt that the Folio text of *Richard III*, however generally superior, has been to some extent purged of oaths in deference to the statute against profanity. In this it may or may not have followed the manuscript upon which it drew for correction, but it cannot be thought to represent the author's intention. The rule McKerrow laid down of following the copy-text in everything save manifest error forced him to reject the oaths that have been cut out of the Folio text, with the consequential loss of Richard's line:

Oh do not swear, my Lord of Buckingham!

One cannot help regretting a principle that leads to this result. For while, of course, in any individual instance, we can have no assurance that the 'reported' text of the Quartos preserves an oath in the form in which Shakespeare intended it, or even, it may be, that he intended an oath at all at that particular point, it may be reasonably argued that by restoring the oaths as they stand in the Quartos an editor would in general approach nearer to Shakespeare's original. Thus it

appears that in certain cases the principle of following the copy-text in all except obvious misprints may conflict with the wider and more important principle of presenting the text in as close an approximation to the author's final intention as the available evidence permits.

I should like to urge that the critical analysis that an editor is bound in general to apply to a number of editions in order to select the most authoritative should be equally applied in an attempt to disentangle the various elements that may be interwoven in the fabric of the chosen text. He cannot altogether avoid bringing judgment to bear upon the details of the text, if only for the removal of evident corruption; and whenever judgment is exercised some risk of error is unavoidable. It is true that one may feel greater confidence in a general than in a more particular analysis, but to draw any hard-and-fast distinction seems neither possible nor desirable, and I cannot but think that an editor is wise to back his own judgment—not, of course, his personal preference, but a judgment of which he can give a reasoned account—rather than seek refuge in the rigour of a mechanical rule.

McKerrow, however, appears to disallow any such critical analysis as I am here supposing. He discusses at some length the relationship of 'derived' editions: and in the case of plays with what he calls 'monogenous' descent, his editorial principles apply, I think, with only minor reservations. But he rather pointedly refrains from discussing the possible relationship between 'substantive' editions. Possibly he would have argued that such a discussion necessarily involved those very speculations as to the *history* of the manuscripts upon which he refused to enter. But it is surely impossible, or rather improper, to choose between 'substantive' texts without having formed some opinion as to their nature at least (inquiry into which he allows on pp. 8-9 to be legitimate) if not as to their relationship. Unless we realize—as McKerrow, of course, realized—that the Quartos of *Richard III* contain some sort of a reported text, while the Folio represents in the main the stage copy, the choice between them can rest upon no more than personal literary taste. And that the latter is indeed the only ground of choice is exactly what he appears to maintain at the top of p. 14, in what is, I think, the weakest passage in his essay, and one moreover in direct conflict with his principle that the authority of editions must be established 'on a consideration of their genetic relationship' (pp. 7-8).

No doubt there are certain considerations that need to be borne in

mind. One is the awful warning of the harm that Shakespeare has suffered from the undisciplined interference of former editors. This naturally makes a successor shy of following the promptings of individual judgment, and encourages reliance on fixed and conservative rules for guidance. Next, we must remember that McKerrow's practice was governed—so I suppose—by the requirements of what was to be a standard edition, coloured as little as possible by the personality of the editor; further that he knew he was unlikely to live to complete the edition, and may consequently have felt bound to formulate such rules as would enable the work to be carried on by others in a generally consonant manner.

At the same time, the reaction against the eclectic methods of most of the great editors of Shakespeare, however necessary and salutary, may be carried too far. Their fundamental mistake was not so much that they were prepared on occasion to introduce into the copy-text readings from other sources, as that in doing so they relied upon personal predilection instead of critical analysis. It is in our power of critical analysis that the main advance in Shakespearian study since the beginning of the present century has been made. I am not now thinking of those far-reaching speculations as to the evolution of the manuscripts of his plays, which McKerrow quite rightly held to be out of the sphere of the textual editor, but of investigations into the relationship of extant texts to one another and into the nature of their immediate sources, the validity of which he recognized, but of which it appears to me that he refused to avail himself as he might. This refusal to carry through the critical analysis to its legitimate conclusion, with its textual consequences, must be regarded as a blemish in McKerrow's work. So limited, his standard edition, however mechanically perfect, could not altogether reflect the position of present-day scholarship or do full justice to his own powers as a critic. That he was himself competent to carry through the necessary analysis I have no manner of doubt. Whether he may or may not have been wise to refuse to leave it to be carried out by others is a different question.

I add a few observations on points of minor and more particular interest.

In the first place it will be well to clear up a few cases of apparent inconsistency. In the middle paragraph on p. 12 McKerrow discusses a passage that needs two emendations to reduce it to sense, and

remarks that however certain we may be that these emendations are correct, 'the only readings that have any *authority*' are those of the transmitted text. However, he proceeds, rather surprisingly: 'I shall use then "authoritative reading" for any reading which may be presumed to derive by direct descent from the manuscript of the author.' But if the emendations just discussed are correct the transmitted readings cannot 'be presumed' to be those of the author's manuscript: whence then their authority? We may suppose that what McKerrow really had in mind was that, whether or not a misprint in the most authoritative edition could be called an 'authoritative reading', no reading drawn from any other source could claim the designation. (This is not in fact, I think, true when there is more than one substantive edition, but it is in agreement with McKerrow's general argument.)

I have already observed that one rule laid down by McKerrow is that if a later 'derived' edition contains corrections by the author then that edition should not indeed itself be taken as the copy-text, but the corrections it contains should be accepted and incorporated in that text (pp. 17-18). However, on p. 14 we read: 'If we had external evidence that a particular text of any work had been revised throughout by its author, such a text should undoubtedly be made the basis of a modern edition', *i.e.* be taken as the copy-text. This appears at first sight to conflict with what is said three pages later. But really he has different cases in mind. We need not stress the question of 'external evidence', which is anyhow rather irrelevant, but should observe that the rule laid down on pp. 17-18 is qualified by the words 'unless we could show that the edition in question (or the copy from which it had been printed) had been gone over and corrected throughout' by the author, which link up with 'revised throughout' on p. 14. The distinction is between casual correction of a few errors on the one hand and thorough revision on the other, though how the line between them was to be drawn is not very clear. However, McKerrow clearly thought that authoritative corrections might get into a Shakespearian text either from the author himself, or from comparison with a stage manuscript, or from a Quarto that had been used as a prompt book (pp. 16-17); while on the contrary he wrote (p. 14): 'so far as I am aware, it has never been suggested that there is any such external evidence of [thorough] correction in the case of any Shakespearian play.' He might, however, have made his meaning clearer.

A similar case concerns the manuscripts of the plays. Enumerating the various matters dealt with in his introductions to the several plays, McKerrow writes (p. 99): 'although I have summarized recent opinions on the history of Shakespeare's manuscripts before they got into print . . . I have made no attempt at full discussion. . . . I myself doubt if . . . sufficient certainty can be reached on the subject of the manuscripts to make such researches more than interesting speculations.' He makes no further mention of the manuscripts in this place and we are left to conclude that he deprecated all discussion of the subject. However, on turning to p. 9, to which reference is made, we read (beginning at the foot of p. 8) that 'The general character of the copy from which the substantive text (or texts) of a work was set up [that is, of course, usually a manuscript] can often be determined with some degree of probability, and when this is possible it is the concern of an editor, as it naturally has a bearing on the degree of credence which he should give to the readings of the substantive texts in question.' This then is a matter that would naturally be discussed in the introduction. But we should observe that on p. 99 the stress is on the *history* of the manuscripts rather than their *character*, and what McKerrow had in mind was evidently the complicated and highly speculative theories that have sometimes been advanced concerning the stages by which they reached their final form, theories which he does also deprecate on p. 9. It is possible that when, on p. 98, he wrote, 'I have . . . discussed at such length as seemed necessary the relationship between the early editions', he intended this to cover a discussion of the manuscripts behind them, but the casual reader would hardly interpret the words in this sense.

The amusing footnote on p. 38 is a red herring. Taken seriously it can only mean that we are unable to distinguish between sense and nonsense, which is to make nonsense of textual criticism. But on the same page there is a serious argument with which I find it hard to agree. Unless we include the altogether exceptional case of the Jonson Folio of 1616, I cannot recall any Elizabethan reprint that was so consistently corrected as to raise a presumption in favour of any reading it left standing.

This leads me to a few points of practice that either appear to need elucidation or to be open to question.

Page 55. One would have expected that when discussing 'asides' McKerrow would have touched on the question of 'address'. It is

not invariably clear from the text to whom a character is speaking, and the early editions seldom give any direction. Editors have commonly made good the defect; but from the specimen pages (II. i. 32) it would seem that McKerrow rejected such additions, though whether he intended to do so in all cases there is nothing to show.

Page 94. 'Enter Armorer and his Man' is the Folio direction at 2 *Henry VI*, I. iii. 171. It seems agreed that they are brought in by attendants under guard. But 'Following my general rule . . . of omitting attendants' McKerrow does not mention the fact. This is hardly the point: what is important is to know whether they come in of their own accord or are brought in as prisoners. Theobald's addition, 'guarded', seems desirable.

Page 103, *Omission of capitals*. In some copy-texts the verse is largely uncapitalized. 'In such a case the lines are given capitals in accordance with the normal practice, and a general note is added in the first place where the change is made calling attention to their frequent absence in the original.' This buries the information very effectively. Any general change of the sort should be mentioned in the introduction.

I will now take a number of disconnected points in the order in which they occur.

Page 11, foot. For strict accuracy the condition excluding correction by the author or from his manuscript should be extended to cover readings derived from performance or from a lost edition.

Page 14, lines 6-8: 'the editor must select the text . . . which appears to be the most careful copy of its original and the most free from obvious errors.' I have already said that the whole passage is unsatisfactory. But, unless by 'its original' he meant 'the author's original' (which would make the remark something trite) the sentence can hardly represent McKerrow's intention. Take a carefully edited 'report', accurately printed—supposing such a thing to exist. This might be quite free from 'obvious errors' and reproduce 'its original,' namely, the reporter's script, quite accurately. On the other hand, a careless print of difficult 'foul papers' or of a worn-out prompt book would certainly teem with errors and not accurately represent any possible original. But to suppose that McKerrow would have chosen the former is absurd.

Page 50, top: 'it seems possible that the division [into acts and scenes] was in all cases the work of the compilers of the Folio and was not found in the original manuscript.' This overlooks certain

evidence. The very unequal length of the acts in 1 *Henry VI* suggests that it may have undergone alteration *after* the division was introduced (you can't shut your eyes altogether to the *history* of the manuscripts!): there is also some ground for supposing that the scene division in *Lear* is original (*R.E.S.*, July 1940, pp. 300 ff.).

Page 106, lines 14-17. 'The earlier editors, so far as they concerned themselves with the relationship of editions at all, seem generally to have relied solely on the evidence of readings. This, of course, is in general a perfectly satisfactory method though a very laborious one.' It may be a satisfactory method of arranging a number of editions in sequence. Experience shows that it is practically useless for deciding priority between two editions.

Lines 23-25: 'it is a general rule that the less significant the readings varied are, from the literary point of view, the greater is their weight as evidence of the genetic relationships of the texts in which they occur.' This is important, but it needs the proviso that the readings must be genuine variants and not merely alternative forms that a compositor might interchange according to taste.

Page 107, last paragraph. 'It is important to notice that such an arrangement of misprints as this [some common to A and B, some to B and C, none to A and C] would not *by itself*, and unless it were known at least which of the editions was earliest, give us any information as to the relationship of the editions.' For 'any information' we must read 'definite information': the arrangement informs us that the relationship must be one of the three previously mentioned. Nor is the end of the paragraph very clear. The point is that the typographical evidence indicates which of the editions *is* the earliest and therefore decides between the three possibilities left open by the misprints.

There are two instances of definite error: curious but neither of any importance. In the passage about *Volpone* on p. 45 it is clear that McKerrow must have misunderstood his own notes. The date of the Quarto is 1607 not 1616 (which is that of the Folio), the lines are quoted exactly as they appear in the Folio (not the Quarto), and all three Folios preserve the same arrangement. Again, on p. 47, he remarks that some prose lines in *Romeo and Juliet* are 'printed in the Folio as verse, owing in all probability to the compositor having merely followed the distribution of the lines in his manuscript'. McKerrow had momentarily forgotten that the Folio text of this play was not printed from manuscript but from a Quarto. No doubt his explanation

McKERROW'S 'PROLEGOMENA' RECONSIDERED 149

is correct when applied to the Quarto of 1599, and he in fact quotes the lines as they appear in that Quarto and not as they appear in the Folio.¹

I hope that these few notes may help to remove certain difficulties in the way of a full understanding and appreciation of a really great work.

¹ Misprints are rare, but on p. 49, in l. 10—'where the Folio prints as two'—either 'where' should be 'which', or 'as' should be deleted; while in note 3 on p. 98 '1640' should be '1660'. The details of the collations are so exactly thought out that I am tempted to mention that at p. 87, l. 7, and at p. 89, l. 18, there should be no space before the caret-mark (*cf.* p. 76, l. 21, and specimen pages, II. i. 26–27). The queer punctuation (commas outside parentheses) in the collations at p. 83, ll. 31–32, and p. 94, l. 9, is evidently intentional. There are a few oversights in the specimen pages, but they are immaterial.

GEORGE HERBERT AND THE EMBLEM BOOKS

BY ROSEMARY FREEMAN

The Emblem Book was a literary form which had much vitality in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Although little is heard of it now, it was serious enough then to attract men of some minor ability, and people like Henry Peacham, George Wither, and Francis Quarles added books of emblems to their many other publications. The nature of the convention was, however, such as to make it more valuable as a means to an end than as an end in itself, and consequently its greatest success lay in its applications and transformations in other poetry and not in its use in the Emblem Books proper. It had considerable influence on the poets of the period: Donne, Crashaw, and Vaughan—to name only the outstanding figures—all owed something to the Emblem Book, and among the lesser writers there are many traces of a similar interest. An extreme example is Mildmay Fane, Earl of Westmorland, whose *Otia Sacra* (1648) is a collection of poems consciously, and often indeed fantastically, emblematic. But the poet whose work comes nearest to that of the emblem writers, while at the same time being infinitely more distinguished, is George Herbert; and I wish here to show how a convention which in itself produced only mediocre writing was modified to suit the purposes of a great poet.

I

Of the history of the emblem convention not much need be said. In 1531 an Italian lawyer, Andrea Alciati, published an *Emblematum Liber*, a small volume containing ninety-eight woodcuts, with mottoes and short poems attached to each. This formed the model upon which innumerable other books of emblems were constructed. The *Emblematum Liber* itself was enlarged and reprinted again and again; it went into ninety editions in the sixteenth century alone; it was wedged between solemn and cumbrous annotations, translated into French, Italian, English, and Spanish, and modified and imitated everywhere. Independent French Emblem Books were written soon

after the first publication of Alciati: de la Perrière's *Théâtre des Bons Engins* was published in 1539, Corrozet's *Hecatographie* in 1540, and Paradin's *Devises Héroïques* in 1557. English reaction was slower; partly because of the backward state of engraving in this country and partly because Latin and French presented no barriers to the class of readers for whom the books were written, Emblem Books did not appear in the vernacular until 1586, when Plantin published Geoffrey Whitney's *A Choice of Emblems and Other Devises*. This was in the main an anthology of foreign emblems, the pictures being provided from Plantin's large stock of plates. It was, however, quickly followed by attempts at original work, and besides translations of Paradin and de la Perrière,¹ there were several Emblem Books in English which had no immediate foreign source; the *Sacrorum Emblematum Centuria Una* of Andrew Willet, a prodigy of learning and industry who poured out books in such profusion that an astonished contemporary was provoked to remark that he 'must write as he sleeps, it being impossible he should do so much waking!' is one of these, and another is Henry Peacham's *Minerva Britannia*, published in 1612. Peacham had the greatest enthusiasm for emblems, and he also made three manuscript collections, one of which was coloured for presentation to Prince Henry.

These Emblem Books all have the same characteristics. Each emblem was made up of a symbolical picture, a brief motto or *sententia*, and an explanatory poem. The purpose of the motto was to complete and interpret the picture, while the picture gave meaning to the motto: neither could stand without the other. The purpose of the poem, the third essential feature, was to explain the whole and to point the moral. The three parts were called by the emblem writers and their critics the 'picture', the 'word', and the 'explanation' or 'mind' of the emblem, respectively. For example, the first emblem in Whitney's *Choice* was taken from Paradin's plate of the device of the Cardinal of Lorraine. The picture represents a pillar round which is twined a stem of ivy; the motto or word is *TE STANTE VIREBO*. The poem interprets the symbolism and at the same time pays a graceful compliment to Queen Elizabeth:

A mightie Spyre, whose toppe doth pierce the skie,
An iuie greene imbraceth rounde about,
And while it standes, the same doth bloome on highe,

¹ *The Heroicall Devises* of M. Claudius Paradin, translated from Latin into English by P. S. London, 1591; and *The Theatre of Fine Devises*, translated by Thomas Combe. London, 1614. (Entered in S.R. 1593.)

But when it shrinkes, the iuie standes in dowl:
 The Piller great, our gracious Princes is:
 The braunche, the Church: whoe speakes unto hir this;

I, that of late with stormes was almoste spent,
 And brused sore with Tirants bluddie bloes,
 Whome fire, and sworde, with persecution rent,
 Am nowe sett free, and ouerlooke my foes,
 And whiles thow raignt, oh most renowned Queene
 By thie supporte my blossome shall bee greene.

The subjects treated by the emblem writers were drawn from all sources. Whitney divides his into three groups, natural, historical, and moral, natural being the wonders of nature, usually the wonders of Pliny and Æsop; historical, tales from classical history and myth; and moral, anything that will not fit into the other categories. In the work of Peacham, and to a lesser degree in Whitney, a number of personifications were also used, the motto then being replaced by the name of the figure personified. Such figures were always easily recognizable by external marks: Whitney's *Invidia* has a forked tongue, *Occasion* a long forelock, *Temperance* a bit and bridle. These personifications form one of the links between the Emblem Books and other literature; Peacham, for instance, drew some from Spenser, and others from the *Iconologia* of Cesar Ripa, which was used by Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones as a source-book for figures for masques.

A later development of the emblem convention, which must be mentioned for its relevance to the work of Herbert, is seen in the Emblems of Love, love profane and love divine. These emblems flourished particularly in Holland, and were used by the Jesuits as a means of teaching ethical and religious doctrine.¹ It is to this branch of the convention that the work of Quarles belongs. The technique remained substantially the same as in the earlier type of Emblem Book, but the material was new. In Quarles's *Emblemes* (1635) two figures, Amor, representing divine love, and Anima, the human soul, walk the world together. Anima falls into the snares of the devil and is restored by Amor, and reunited to him; she is shipwrecked and moves through the waters towards his outstretched hand; or she is brought to judgment before him by Justice. Another type of Jesuit Emblem work is exemplified in Christopher Harvey's *Schola Cordis*

¹ A full account of the Dutch Emblem Books and the way in which the tradition of Profane Love was modified by the Jesuits for religious purposes is given by Prof. Mario Praz in *Studies in Seventeenth Century Imagery*. Warburg Institute, 1939.

(1647), which was adapted from B. van Haeften's book of the same name. In this the human heart becomes the centre of interest. The emblems depict the fall of man in Eden, and the ensuing darkness, vanity, covetousness, hardness, and insatiability of his heart, which is, however, persuaded to return to Christ; and in the series of emblems which follow it is purified and prepared for heaven. The plates show the actual processes of redemption. The heart is burnt on a sacrificial altar, washed in a fountain of blood, ploughed and sown with good seed; it is portrayed as infested with serpents, crushed flat beneath a press, hung round with symbols of this world's vanity, or given an ever-open eye in accordance with the text *I sleep but mine heart waketh*. This curious symbolism was more successful than might at first be expected in a Protestant country, and Harvey's book was reprinted twice in the seventeenth century and later attributed to Quarles, with whose *Emblemes* it was afterwards bound up. Another English Emblem Book which belongs to the same category as these is Edmund Arwaker's version of one of Quarles's sources, Herman Hugo's *Pia Desideria*,¹ which was made because the translator considered that 'Mr. Quarles only borrowed his emblems to prefix them to a much inferior sense'.

There were probably a number of different reasons for the popularity of the Emblem Book in general and of Quarles in particular. Walpole, indeed, remarked that even Milton had had to wait until the world had done admiring Quarles; but then Quarles had an unusual gift for popularity. The Emblem Books did, however, make an appeal as a literary form, quite apart from the individual merits of Quarles's work. They had the attraction of pictures, and those sometimes of a high standard—Wither's Emblem Book, for instance, is illustrated with engravings by Crispin der Pass; they taught a moral lesson; and, finally, their symbolism was just difficult enough to make the discovery of its meaning an intellectual adventure of a not too strenuous kind. (It was considered a fault to make an emblem too obscure; Shakespeare's only recorded experiment in the field failed because nobody understood it.²) Their charms were, in fact, various, and there is no doubt that, for one reason or another, many seventeenth-century readers were familiar with the convention in its different forms.

¹ Antwerp. 1624. Quarles's other source was *Typus Mundi*, published by the Jesuit College of Rhetoric at Antwerp. 1627. See an article by G. S. Haight, *The Library*, 4th Series, vol. xvi, pp. 188 ff.

² See E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare*. Oxford, 1930. vol. II, p. 153.

A convention so popular was ready to hand for any poet to use. The material—the classical myth and legend, fables, natural history, heraldry, in the earlier type, and the regeneration of the human heart or the adventures of Amor and Anima in the later—was easily accessible. The technique was simple and required no great imaginative powers. There was never any necessary essential likeness between the picture and its meaning. Quarles delighted in choosing some entirely arbitrary symbol, and then piling up likenesses which must depend for their validity upon the acceptance of the original comparison; once it is granted that man's soul is an organ, or our life the image of a winter's day, detail upon detail may be added and the original point of resemblance indefinitely expanded. The details, however, never illuminate the image: they merely extend it. The more curious and unusual the comparison the better the 'wit'. Thus Bunyan, in his Emblem Book, *A Book for Boys and Girls* (1686), chooses an egg and finds no less than fourteen points of resemblance between the state of man and that unpromising symbol.

The literature of the first half of the seventeenth century shows how often and how variously the convention was adapted to the purposes of poetry. Crashaw's bleeding and flaming hearts recall one of its main themes, and there is much, too, in the work of Vaughan that can be related to the genre. In his love poems he introduces what are unmistakable emblems:

And on each leafe by Heavens command,
 These Emblemes to the life shall stand:
 Two Hearts, the first a shaft withstood;
 The second, shot, and washt in blood;
 And on this heart a dew shall stay,
 Which no heate can court away;
 But fixt for ever witsnesse beares,
 That hearty sorrow feeds on teares.
 Thus Heaven can make it knowne, and true,
 That you kill'd me, 'cause I lov'd you.¹

Like other poets he is more successful, however, when he does not keep strictly to the rules of the convention he is using. In the *Palm-Tree*, for instance, the favourite emblematic image of the palm which will still flourish under a heavy weight is used to signify those who aspire towards heaven though bowed down by the heavy weight of this world's sin. The image is treated emblematically in that it is first presented and then interpreted, but Vaughan gives it a much fuller

¹ *Les Amours*. Cf. also *Upon the Priorie Grove*, II. 11-14.

and richer meaning by working out the other associations of the palm, its connection with victory and its connection, as a tree, with the Tree of Life, and consequently builds up a complex poem upon the original simple basis. Other parts of *Silex Scintillans* bear in a more general way upon the convention. Vaughan's method is to handle abstract ideas as if they were tangible and visible objects. In *The World*, for instance, the lover is surrounded by

His Lute, his fancy, and his flights,
Wits sour delights.

These are set out pictorially as emblems of his folly, though it is only the first that can be visualized. It is this kind of presentation that gives Vaughan's poetry its mixture of vagueness and precision; and it depends in part on the technique developed in the Emblem Books where the abstract lent itself so readily to formulation in visual terms.

The real triumph of the convention was, however, achieved for it by George Herbert. For the emblem method did not on the whole encourage good work; the pictures freed the poet from the obligation of making his poem stand up by itself, and required so simple an equation between the image and its significance that neither subtlety of tone nor richness of meaning was possible. Good poets, therefore, generally used the emblem as one device among many, and their poems are most successful when they do not cling too closely to the principles of the convention. Herbert, however, accepting the technique in its entirety, was able to turn to advantage both its pictorial quality and its simplicity; and in his work it migrates from what was merely on the level of verse and becomes poetry.

II

The Temple, which was published in 1633, comes very close to that mode which Quarles and his followers were to develop in England a few years later. A poem such as *The Church Floore* is emblematic, although it has no direct dependence on the Emblem Books for its content:

Mark you the floore? that square and speckled stone,
Which looks so firm and strong,
Is PATIENCE:

And th'other black and grave, wherewith each one
Is checker'd all along,
HUMILITIE:

The gentle rising, which on either hand
 Leads to the quire above,
 Is CONFIDENCE:

But the sweet cement, which in one sure band
 Ties the whole frame, is LOVE
 And CHARITIE.

Hither sometimes Sinne steals, and stains
 The marble's neat and curious veins;
 But all is cleansed when the marble weeps.
 Sometimes Death, puffing at the doore,
 Blows all the dust about the floore;
 But while he thinks to spoil the room, he sweeps.

Blest be the Architect Whose art
 Could build so strong in a weak heart! ¹

In some seventeenth century editions² of *The Temple* two engravings were included, one as a setting for *The Altar* and the other for *Superliminarie*, but the method of this poem makes it clear that pictures could not offer any fundamental contribution to the book. They might serve as marginal notes indicating the nature of the poems they illustrate, but they could never become an element in their structure. The visual image is certainly present: it is, in fact, the basis of the poem: but it is present only in complete fusion with its meaning. There can be no elementary separation into 'picture' and 'word' where the floore 'so firm and strong', the 'gentle rising' of the chancel, and the dust of death are involved; they must be understood, to take a phrase from Vaughan, as 'bodied ideas'. Quarles's poetry simply deduces ideas from a given image; and it therefore demands the presence before the eye of an actual picture which can be explored in detail in the verse. Herbert sets out a picture which has already been explored in the mind and which, accordingly, brings with it the knowledge of its own implications.

Herbert's poetry remains primarily visual, and visual in the special sense that has been defined as emblematic. Few of his poems could be labelled 'Emblems' because too much is generally involved in each to allow the unwinking concentration upon one image which characterizes such work. It is, indeed, usually the less successful

¹ *The Temple*, 1633, Oxford University Press, 1913. All quotations are from this text.

² 1674 and thereafter.

poems, such as *Lovejoy*, which are closest to the stock pattern. But everywhere in the formulation of ideas, in lines like this:

Thy root is ever in its grave:¹

in poems consciously patterned such as *Easter Wings* and *The Altar*, and in poems like *The Church Floore* which develop a series of images, a use of language asserts itself that can only be described as emblematic. It is a quality not limited to single lines and scattered phrases but is expressed in the structure of the poems, in the accumulation and inter-relation of their images. This use of language indicates a habitual cast of mind, and becomes central in the verse. To confine the connection of *The Temple* with the Emblem Books to the few poems which can be classified as emblems in strict definition would be not only to ignore much else that is the strength of Herbert's poetry, its range of tone, the complexity of its rhythms, its power of resolving the personal in the liturgical, but even to distort the perspective in which these few are to be seen. For Herbert's work as a whole constitutes the transformation of the methods of the emblematis into a form for poetry.

This poetry is characterized by a simplicity of image, an extreme unobtrusiveness, and a concentration of meaning in which the complexity becomes only gradually apparent. It has not, conspicuously, either the intensity of Donne or the shining brilliance of Vaughan; its strength lies rather in rhythm, in imagery that is essential but rarely rich in itself, in language whose austerity does not preclude abundance. This verse from *Peace*, for instance, is as powerful in its way as the more spectacular kinds of metaphysical poetry:

Sweet Peace, where dost thou dwell? I humbly crave,
 Let me once know.
 I sought thee in a secret cave,
 And ask'd if Peace were there.
 A hollow winde did seem to answer, "No;
 Go seek elsewhere".

All the emptiness and privation of the life of solitude is conveyed in the last two lines, but they depend for their force on their context; taken in isolation they lose half their meaning. Writing of this kind can, however, easily be underestimated, and Herbert's poetry has sometimes been accused of the lack of any real power of thought or imagination. It is useful for this reason to set it beside the fourteenth-century religious lyric, which possesses both the simplicity and the

¹ *Vertue*.

intensely personal note which are usually considered to be Herbert's main virtues. A poem like this fulfils the claims often made for his verse:

Louerd thu clepedest me
an ich nagt ne ansuarede the
Bute wordes scloe and sclepie :
"thole yet! thole a litel!"
Bute "yiet" and "yiet" was endelis,
And "thole a litel" a long wey is.¹

If we are to believe Herbert's critics, his work is not more complex than this. Clearly his simplicity is of a different order. In the first place it disguises a remarkable mastery of tone. So much is done dramatically and by implication:

Then Money came, and chinking still,
"What tune is this, poore man?" said he;
"I heard in Musick you had skill".²

There is the shrug of the shoulder implied in:

How canst Thou brook his foolishnesse?
Why, he'l not lose a cup of drink for Thee:
Bid him but temper his excesse,
Not he: he knows where he can better be—
As he will swear—
Then to serve Thee in fear.³

Secondly, behind seeming simplicity and directness there is often great strength which has its roots in the liturgy. The poem *Peace*, for instance, is a brief allegory of human life. The economy with which the story is told is witness not to poverty of material but to a hand that knows its own resources. In the last verse, accordingly, the references to the Garden and to the bread of life are felt to suggest something more complicated and more universal than would be possible if its brevity were the measure of content:

"Take of this grain, which in my garden grows,
And grows for you;
Make bread of it; and that repose
And peace, which ev'rywhere
With so much earnestnesse you do pursue,
Is onely there."

This is all done so quietly and unemphatically that there is nothing in it that can be isolated. The complexity is evident only in the rhythm,

¹ Carleton Brown, *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century*, No. 5.

² *The Quip*.

³ *Miserie*.

and that is difficult to fasten on. But what establishes the point of the allegory more distinctly than the images alone can do is the cadence of the first two lines which so clearly echoes that of the words of administration in the Mass. Many of Herbert's poems are directly liturgical in this way. *Repentance*, for example, seems to have a general background of psalms and intercessions behind it, and lines like these—

Yet still Thou goest on,
And now with darknesse closest wearie eyes,
Saying to man: "It doth suffice;
Henceforth repose, your work is done."¹

have a finality that suggests the Burial of the Dead, although the expressed intention is only to convey day and night. But the reference to the 'ebonie box' in the next line recalls the same undercurrent of ideas. Other poems have an acknowledged connection with the Prayer Book in that some part of the service is turned into verse; as in the paraphrase of the 23rd Psalm in *The God of Love my Shepherd* is, and, most remarkable of all, *The Sacrifice*, where Herbert achieves a personal and moving effect within a framework that has all the abstractness of ritual.

III

These are some of the virtues of the poetry of *The Temple* and it is to their attainment that the emblem method makes a contribution. For Herbert's images remain emblems and nowhere encroach on the province of symbol. There is no necessary likeness between the church floor and the human heart, between stained glass windows and preachers, or between two rare cabinets filled with treasure and the Trinity and the Incarnation. His method is always to evolve meaning by creating likenesses; the likenesses are rarely inherent or to be seen from the outset. His writing, that is, is inductive not deductive. Each of the epithets in *The Church Floore* adds simultaneously to the image and to the generality behind it, creating the picture in the moral and the moral in the picture, and at the same time maintaining the sharp outlines of both. Out of these is built up the central parallel which is allegory made explicit only in the last couplet:

Blest be the Architect Whose art
Could build so strong in a weak heart!

¹ *Even-Song*.

Herbert himself sums up his method in the poem called *The Rose*:

But I will not much oppose
Unto what you now advise;
Only take this gentle Rose,
And therein my answer lies.

It is chiefly in the principles underlying the work that Herbert's affinities with the Emblem Books are most clearly to be seen, but there are, here and there, references to familiar themes. In *The Church Porch*, for example, one of Alciati's emblems appears. It is that of the ass who, seeing worshippers kneeling to the shrine of Isis on his back, thought they were adoring him:

The shrine is that which thou dost venerate,
And not the beast that bears it on his back.

In *The Size* an emblem is used to clinch the argument of the poem:

..... Call to minde thy dreame,
An earthly globe,
On whose meridian was engraven,
"These seas are tears, and Heav'n the haven".

But apart from one noteworthy exception Herbert uses the actual material of the emblematisers very little, and then not directly. Memories of Amor and Anima are perhaps behind the *Dialogue* and the better known 'Love bade me welcome but my soul drew back', and *Good Friday* may have been written with the imagery of the heart in mind:

Since bloud is fittest, Lord, to write
Thy sorrows in and bloudie fight,
My heart hath store, write there, where in
One box doth lie both ink and sinne:

That when Sinne spies so many foes,
Thy whips, Thy nails, Thy wounds, Thy woes,
All come to lodge there, Sinne may say,
"No room for me", and flie away.

But in all these the connection is only general. The one exception is *Love-Unknowne*. It was quoted by Coleridge in support of his contention that the characteristic fault of the earlier poets was to convey 'the most fantastic thoughts in the most correct and natural language' and, without its context in the tradition to which it belongs, it certainly reads obscurely, and presents, as Coleridge says 'an enigma to thought'.¹

¹ *Biographia Literaria*, Bell, 1898, p. 194.

GEORGE HERBERT AND THE EMBLEM BOOKS 161

The pursuit of the unintelligible never was an interest of Herbert's, and there is no suggestion of it in the tone of the poem. He is merely attempting to do briefly what had already been done at greater length on the Continent and what was to find its way to England in Christopher Harvey's *The School of the Heart*. The poem is an allegory made up of three incidents:

. . . a Lord I had,
And have, of Whom some grounds, which may improve,
I hold for two lives, and both lives in me.
To Him I brought a dish of fruit one day,
And in the middle plac'd my heart. . . .

The Lord, however, rejects the offering and summons instead a servant to wash and wring the heart in a font. Then,

After my heart was well,
And clean and fair, as I one even tide,
I sigh to tell,
Walkt by myself abroad, I saw a large
And spacious fornace flaming, and thereon
A boyling cauldron, round about whose verge
Was in great letters set, "Affliction."

Again the heart is made subject to restoration and the poet hastens home:

But when I thought to sleep out all these faults,
I sigh to speak
I found that some had stuff'd the bed with thoughts,
I would say thorns. . . .

The previous references to *The School of the Heart* indicate the convention out of which the poem was built. There were already a number of publications of this kind available and Herbert may well have seen one. Before his decision to enter the Church he had studied French, Spanish, and Italian in the aspiration of following the example of his predecessor, Sir Francis Nethersole, and obtaining a secretaryship abroad. But another and more immediate background for the poem is to be found in the *Little Gidding Concordances*. In the Book of Revelation there are a number of plates taken from Emblem Books, many of which are in the manner of *The School of the Heart*. Among them is an engraving of a font full of Hearts into which the blood of Christ is streaming; another represents Christ with a lantern entering a Heart crowded with salamanders and other creeping creatures; in others he is enthroned in the Heart, or knocking at its door. All these indicate the kind of collection which Ferrar

made when he was abroad and the type of illustration with which the concordance he presented to Herbert would have been decorated.¹ Certainly the structure of *Love Unknowne* suggests a series of three of this kind visible before the eye. Herbert draws upon the same tradition in the poem *Grace*:

Sinne is still hammering my heart
Unto a hardnesse void of love:
Let suppling grace, to crosse his art,
Drop from above.

But *Love-Unknowne* is the only poem in which all the assumptions of that particular group of Emblem Books is made explicit. It is *The School of the Heart* in little. It has been suggested by Herbert's editor, Mr. G. H. Palmer, that the poem is largely autobiographical, the dish of fruit being an allusion to Herbert's poetry and scholarship at Cambridge, and the cauldron an echo of the state of mind out of which the five poems called *Affliction* were written. It seems injudicious, however, to attribute such interests to any of Herbert's poems; certainly in this the conventional elements outweigh the personal to the extent of suggesting an academic exercise.²

These connections with specific Emblem Books are only occasional, and while they do establish incontrovertibly Herbert's closeness to the form, scattered parallels are never a very fruitful method of comment. And the emblem mode has here a more universal application. What is displayed in every poem is the habitual formulation of ideas in images, each brief and completed yet fully investigated. Poems like *Prayer* which consist wholly in images are only specialized versions of a process that is active everywhere. In the last two stanzas of *Faith*, for example,

That which before was darkned clean
With bushie groves, pricking the looker's eie,
Vanisht away when Faith did change the scene;
And then appear'd a glorious skie.

¹ See an article by Capt. Acland-Troyte (*Archæologia*, 2nd Series. 1888. i, 188-204), who says there is distinct record of a concordance having been made for Herbert, although no trace of it has survived. Ferrar must obviously have made an extensive collection of engravings, and the same picture occurs in different books. The concordance of the Book of Revelation is in the British Museum. Of course, Herbert might have inspected the collection of engravings while he and Ferrar were rebuilding Leighton Church two miles from Little Gidding.

² Contrast for tone *Perseverance* in the Williams MS.

Onely my soule hangs on Thy promises,
With face and hands clinging unto Thy brest;
Clinging and crying, crying without cease,
"Thou art my Rock, thou art my Rest."

What though my bodie runne to dust?
Faith cleaves unto it, counting ev'ry grain
With an exact and most particular trust,
Reserving all for flesh again.

the close particularization of the phrase 'pricking the looker's eye' and the last three lines show how fully the image has been explored. In the *Country Parson*¹ Herbert had advocated the 'diligent collation of Scripture with Scripture', and in the poem called *The Pearl*, the ways of Learning, of Honour, and of Pleasure are all present in the mind:

I know all these, and have them in my hand:
Therefore not seeled, but with open eyes
I flie to Thee . . .

It is on this habitual completeness of knowledge that the simplicity of Herbert's poetry is based. Speculation which has travelled far and felt intensely is contracted into a single image; and the poem offers a picture that is deceptively precise and clear-cut. In some poems the stanza form supplies in itself an unacknowledged central image. *Easter Wings* and *The Altar*, for instance, are written in those actual shapes; *Sunday* has stanzas of seven lines; and in *Sinnes Round* his 'offences course it in a ring', each verse beginning with the last line of the preceding one; in *A Wreath* the same method is repeated and Herbert achieves a remarkable *tour de force* in building up a poem of overlapping lines:

A Wreathed garland of deserved praise,
Of praise deserved, unto Thee I give,
I give to Thee, Who knowest all my wayes,
My crooked winding wayes, wherein I live.

In all these the title describes what has been done by the stanza form, demonstrates the picture which the actual set-out of the poem on the page would offer to the eye. In others the same method is used more subtly. In *The Pulley* the image of a pulley is nowhere present in the substance of the poem; yet the title makes its whole point:

When God at first made man,
Having a glass of blessings standing by,
"Let us," said He, "poure on him all we can;
Let the world's riches, which dispersed lie,
Contract into a span".

So strength first made a way;
Then beautie flow'd, then wisdom, honour, pleasure;

¹ iv. *The Parsons Knowledge*.

When almost all was out, God made a stay,
Perceiving that, alone of all His treasure,
Rest in the bottome lay.

"For if I should," said He,
"Bestow this jewell also on My creature,
He would adore My gifts instead of Me,
And rest in Nature, not the God of Nature:
So both should losers be.

Yet let him keep the rest,
But keep them with repining restlesnesse;
Let him be rich and wearie, that at least,
If goodnesse lead him not, yet wearinesse
May tosse him to My breast".

In the same way in *The Collar*, that one image informs the whole. All through the poem an active profession of violence and confusion is made, and yet, collarwise, it is controlled by a single line at the end:

But as I rav'd and grew more fierce and wilde
At every word,
Methought I heard one calling, "Childe";
And I reply'd, "My Lord".

The care with which Herbert named the poems is obvious from the poems themselves. In *The Temple* even the incomplete *The Size* has a title, and some had been re-named to make their meaning clearer. *Prayer* in the Williams Manuscript¹ becomes *Church Lock and Key*; *The Passion, Redemption*; and *Invention, Jordan*. It seems that all the changes were towards the concrete; the original title for the poem which begins 'Teach me my God and King . . .' was *Perfection the Elixir*, but in the final version the generalized idea has been dropped and only the second half of the title preserved.

The personifications in *The Temple* also reflect Herbert's modification of the ways of the emblematisers. It was not a device that he used very often and his figures are entirely his own. They carry no bit, bridle, anchor or other recognizable paraphernalia, nor is any single one of them described directly. Any attributes they may have are shown by implication: Glorie comes

puffing by
In silks that whistled, who but he!²

¹ There are two manuscripts of Herbert's poems, the Williams and the Bodleian. The Williams contains fewer poems than the Bodleian, and is thought by Herbert's editor, Mr. G. H. Palmer, to be the earlier.

² *The Quip*.

Religion and Sinne are contrasted :

Religion, like a pilgrime, Westward bent,
Knocking at all doores ever as She went.

and Sinne :

travell'd Westward also : journeying on
He chid the Church away where e're he came,
Breaking her peace and tainting her good name.¹

Yet figures like these are much more fully realized than those which are described at such length by the emblem writers. Their attributes are not hung upon them from outside like the clothes of a cardboard doll, but are intrinsic. They appear only briefly, but their function is always completed. In *The Quip* a series of figures is introduced, each of which has his characteristic speech and gesture :

First Beautie crept into a rose,
Which when I pluckt not, "Sir," said she,
"Tell me, I pray, whose hands are those?"
But Thou shalt answer, Lord, for me.

The poem describes a trial of faith. It is also a definition of faith. The strength of the resisting virtue is measured by the plausibility of the figures who confront it; and there emerges at the same time a clear conviction of the nature of that virtue. For each figure is the single embodiment of both tempter and temptation. Once again the image has been explored to its farthest limits.

The ability to express complex thoughts and sensations in poetry was typical of the metaphysical poets as a whole, but the precision and simplicity which Herbert achieved in his expression of them was perhaps attainable only when the emblem convention flourished. Certainly no other poet has been able to concentrate so rich a meaning within so simple a framework.

¹ *The Church Militant.*

PLOT AS AN ESSENTIAL IN POETRY

BY CORNELL MARCH DOWLIN

No modern commentator on Aristotle's *Poetics* fails to remark that the famous treatise is incomplete, obscure, and at times inconsistent. Certainly its shortcomings as an exposition of poetic will be obvious to any student of literature despite the fact that even now it exercises a greater influence, perhaps, than any other single work of criticism. To-day its inconsistencies and incompleteness are being corrected by a closer comparison with the rest of Aristotle's works, with which it must be studied, and by alert textual criticism. Renaissance critics, however, exhibited rather more of the scholastic than of the scientific spirit, and many of the neo-classical fallacies resulted from their worship of the supreme dictator of literature. Bacon and Hobbes can hardly be numbered among the slavishly Aristotelian critics; yet their definitions of poetry, both of them unacceptable to-day, clearly reveal a too rigid interpretation of the *Poetics*.

Not the least interesting passage in Thomas Hobbes's 'Answer' (1650) to Davenant's 'Preface to *Gondibert*' is the following, found near the beginning, where he sets forth, as a careful philosopher should, his basic principles:

They that take for Poesy whatsoever is writ in Verse will think this Division imperfect, and call in Sonets, Epigrams, Eclogues, and the like peeces, which are but Essayes and parts of an entire Poem, and reckon *Empedocles* and *Lucretius* (natural Philosophers) for Poets, and the moral precepts of *Phocylides*, *Theognis*, and the Quatraines of *Pybrach* and the History of *Lucan*, and others of that kind amongst Poems, bestowing on such Writers for honor the name of Poets rather then of Historians or Philosophers. But the subject of a Poem is the manners of men, not natural causes; manners presented, not dictated; and manners feigned, as the name of Poesy imports, not found in men. They that give entrance to Fictions writ in Prose err not so much, but they err.¹

That his exclusion of what we might call expository verse from the

¹ J. E. Spingarn, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*. (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1908), II, 55-6. All subsequent references to Spingarn, unless otherwise noted, will be to this work.

realm of poetry is not casual but is fundamental to Hobbes's æsthetic is evident from the passage immediately preceding, in which all poetry is divided into three types: heroic, scommatic (satirical), and pastoral, each of which may be either narrative or dramatic in form. Material for these types is supplied by the court, the city, or the country, to which the three varieties respectively correspond.

Anyone reading these passages will at once hear echoes of Aristotle's *Poetics* and very probably of Bacon's *Advancement of Learning*, where poetry is asserted to be 'nothing else but FAINED HISTORY, which may be stiled as well in Prose as in Verse', and to be of three kinds: 'POESIE NARRATIVE, REPRESENTATIVE, AND ALLVSIVE.' Another name for allusive poetry is the 'paraboli-call', which is a 'NARRATION applied onely to expresse some speciall purpose or conceit.'¹ Bacon, like Hobbes, limited poetry to composition which told a story, and it is not surprising that in the corresponding passage in the *De Augmentis Scientiarum* satires, elegies, epigrams, and odes are taken from the realm of poetry and are handed over to philosophy and oratory.²

The exclusion of lyrical and other non-narrative and non-dramatic forms of poetry has not failed to receive attention, though not on the basis of their structure. Of Hobbes's rejection of everything that does not possess a plot, Spingarn says: "Bacon had set the example for this indifference [to lyrical forms], and Temple³ follows in the path of Hobbes. Nor is there any place for didactic

¹ *Ibid.*, I, 5-7.—Because of Bacon's interest in the allegorical interpretation of the classics, his 'allusive' poetry is usually referred to now as allegory. The corresponding passage in the *De Augmentis* reads: 'Parabolica vero est Historia cum typo, quae intellectualia deducit ad sensum.' (II, xiii; *Works*, ed. Spedding, Ellis, and Heath, I, 518.) He was also interested, it would seem, in the apposite examples made use of by the orator.

² *Ibid.*, I, 518.—Because of its emphasis on narration, the following from *The Advancement of Learning* is also worth noting: 'Diuine learning receiue the same distribution . . . So as Theologie consisteth also of Historie of the Church, of Parables, which is Diuine Poetrie, and of holie Doctrine or Precept. For as for that part which seemeth supernumerarie, which is Prophecies, it is but Diuine Historie, which hath that prerogatiue ouer humane as the Narration may bee before the fact as well as after.' Spingarn, I, 4.

³ Spingarn's note here refers to 'Of Poetry' as printed in *Miscellanea, the Seconde Part*, 3rd ed. (1692), 349. I have not been able to examine this edition, and the second edition (1690), a copy of which is in the library of the University of Pennsylvania, has a different pagination. Apparently Spingarn's reference is to: 'When I speak of Poetry, I mean not an Ode or an Elegy, a Song or a Satyr, nor by a Poet the Composer of any of these, but of a just Poem' (Spingarn, III, 82), after which follows a discussion of Homer and Virgil. But elsewhere Temple speaks of '*Simonides, Phocillides, Theognis*, and several other of the smaller *Greek Poets*' (*ibid.*, III, 89) and otherwise indicates that in his opinion the minor forms are of a lower rank, but poetry nevertheless.

verse, for the subject of poetry is not natural causes or moral theory, but 'the manners of men', presented in the guise of life-like fiction. The exclusion of didactic verse is Aristotelian, and had furnished the subject for infinite controversy in the Renaissance; but the seventeenth century tended more and more to follow Roman practice rather than Aristotelian precept in this respect. Yet Hobbes's 'manners of men' fails to suggest that the whole content of human life (ἡθῆ, πάθη, πράξεις) is the subject matter of poetry, and is Horatian rather than Aristotelian.¹

Bacon's attitude, Spingarn says: 'clearly foreshadows the neo-classical indifference to lyric poetry . . . [and] his classification of the lyric with philosophy and rhetoric explains the impersonal and imitative forms of lyric poetry at the end of the sixteenth century, and looks to the more complicated forms of the "metaphysical school"'.²

It would seem odd that two such similar expressions by Bacon and Hobbes, philosophers whose personal contact is well known, should not have received more attention. A recent publication, *The Aesthetic Theory of Thomas Hobbes*,³ makes no reference to the matter, save to record Hobbes's statement in a summary of the 'Answer to Davenant'. Presumably this is because the work in question deals specially with the psychological aspects of Hobbes's criticism.⁴ Similarly an otherwise exhaustive article on 'Bacon's True Opinion of Poetry'⁵ is devoted exclusively to Bacon's statements concerning imagination. Beyond recording the fact that Bacon divided poetry into epic, drama, and allegory, its author makes no comment on the rejection of poetry that has an expository form. Another writer remarks in passing that the rhetorical quality of *energia*, which Sidney says is especially to be used by a lover to persuade his mistress, 'may be one reason for Bacon's classification of lyric poetry as a part of rhetoric'.⁶ Although the latter writer frequently insists that Aristotle, throughout the *Poetics*, implies that poetry is a time art

¹ *Ibid.*, I, xxxi-xxxii.

² *Ibid.*, I, xii-xiii.

³ Clarence DeWitt Thorpe (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1940).

⁴ Professor Thorpe's book represents such a thorough investigation of the background of Hobbes's criticism that one should hardly suggest any additions to it. And yet, since the book treats *imitation* in great detail, Hobbes's implied insistence on plot might have been considered, for the *Poetics* specifically states that plot is an imitation of an action. VIII, 4.

⁵ Murray W. Bundy, *Studies in Philology*, xxviii (1930), 244-64.

⁶ Donald L. Clark, *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1922), 85-6.

and therefore narrative or dramatic, he does not explain Bacon's rejection of lyric forms on the basis of their expository structure, that is, because of their failure to have a plot, or in other words to be an imitation of an action.¹

In fact form seems to have been ignored for the subject matter of poetry. A footnote to Spingarn's statement on Hobbes, quoted above,² that the exclusion of didactic verse has provided the material for infinite controversy during the Renaissance, directs attention to the following: 'Poetry then, is an ideal representation of life; but should it be still further limited, and made an imitation of only human life? In other words, are the actions of men the only possible themes of poetry, or may it deal, as in the *Georgics* and the *De Rerum Natura*, with the various facts of external nature and of science, which are only indirectly connected with human life? May poetry treat of the life of the world as well as of the life of men; and if only of the latter, is it to be restricted to the actions of men, or may it also depict their passions, emotions, and character?'³

Then follows an analysis of Aristotle's Italian commentators, from Fracastoro, who insisted that 'all matters are proper material for the poet, as Horace says, if they are treated poetically,'⁴ to Castelvetro, who 'finds that the test of poetry is not the metre but the material.' 'This', Spingarn adds, 'approximates to Aristotle's own view; since, while imitation is what distinguishes the poetic art, Aristotle by limiting it to the imitation of human life, was, after all, making the matter the test of poetry.'⁵

A closer examination of Hobbes's pronouncements reveals, however, that Hobbes is concerned more with form than with subject matter. For one thing, there is the insistence that verse is necessary; but more important in the present discussion is the statement that 'the subject of a Poem is the manners of men, not natural causes; manners presented, not dictated, manners feigned, as the name of Poesy imports.'

Now it must be obvious that the manners of men can furnish

¹ Much might be said concerning the lyrical quality of narrative and dramatic poetry and their subordinate parts, and of the *action* that a lyric in customary expository form imitates. For a further consideration of this point, see below.

² P. 167.

³ Spingarn, *Literary Criticism in the Renaissance*, 2d ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1930), 39.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 41.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 44-5.—But it is worth noting that Castelvetro insists that 'the fable is the end of tragedy, and therefore of every kind of poem.' *Poetica d'Aristotele*, 2d ed. (Basle: 1576), 140.

subject matter for lyrical and didactic poetry, but lest there be any mistake on that point Hobbes declares for 'manners [re]presented' (or imitated). Added to this is his division of poetry into the 'Heroique, Scommatique, and Pastorall,' each of which 'is distinguished again in the manner of *Representation*, which sometimes is *Narrative*, wherein the Poet himself relateth, and sometimes *Dramatique*, as when the persons are every one adorned and brought upon the Theater to speak and act their own parts.'¹

And as with Hobbes, so with Bacon, each of whose three kinds of poetry has a plot. The most casual reading of the passages in the *Advancement of Learning* and the *De Augmentis* will make it clear that Bacon and Hobbes think alike and that Hobbes's ideas derive from Bacon's, save for the former's insistence on verse and his reclassification of the basic types, which is the result of the political philosopher's deriving of subject matter from court, city, and country.

It is not necessary to search through Italian and French criticism, or even English criticism to find a source for these beliefs that plot is essential to poetry. We may turn to the *Poetics* and find in its opening sentence alone sufficient explanation of the commonly-held belief that a plot was the mark of poetry. That part of this sentence which is of interest to us here reads:

περὶ ποιητικῆς αὐτῆς . . . καὶ πῶς δεῖ συνίστασθαι τοὺς μύθους εἰ μέλλει καλῶς ἔξεν ἡ ποίησις. . . .²

Butcher's rendering of the complete passage is:

I propose to treat of Poetry in itself and of its several species, noting the essential quality of each; to inquire into the structure of the plot as requisite to a good poem.³

In this translation the implications with respect to the importance of plot are obvious, and they are only slightly less so in Bywater's: 'I propose to speak . . . of the structure of plot required for a good poem.'⁴ Alfred Gudeman, however, gives us: 'Wir wollen reden über die Dichtkunst . . . und wie die dichterischen Stoffe gestaltet werden müssen.'⁵ He insists that *μῦθος* has a variety of meanings

¹ Spingarn, II, 55.

² S. H. Butcher, *The Poetics of Aristotle* (London: 1895), 6. This is identical with Alfred Gudeman's text (*Aristoteles ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΙΗΤΙΚΗΣ*, Berlin: 1934, 31) and does not differ in any essential from a text that was standard three hundred years ago: Isaac Casaubon, *Operum Aristotelis* . . . Nova Editio, (Lyons: 1590), 373.

³ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁴ Ingram Bywater, *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry* (Oxford: 1909), 3.

⁵ *Aristoteles über die Dichtkunst* (Leibzig: 1921), 1.

in the *Poetics* and that in this passage it is a synonym for πράγματα.¹

A modern reader can readily accept his view, but we should bear in mind that in the *Poetics* the usual meaning of μῦθος is *plot* and that the word appears with especial frequency in chapter VI, where the six elements of tragedy are discussed. Especially interesting is the following: 'ἔστιν δὲ τῆς μὲν πράξεως ὁ μῦθος ἡ μίμησις· λέγω γὰρ μῦθον τοῦτον τὴν σύνθεσιν τῶν πραγμάτων.'² which seems to suggest that μῦθος is not a synonym for πράγματα, but rather that although the latter word may well mean *subject matter*, it may also mean *incident*, and that a plot is a collection of incidents arranged in accordance with the demands of dramatic or epic composition.

But the present discussion is concerned, not with what modern commentators believe Aristotle meant, but with the opinion held at about 1600. And to discover this we can do no better than to turn to a widely accepted Latin translation of that time, no English translations having yet appeared. In a Latin version that Bacon must have been familiar with, the opening words of the *Poetics* are: 'De Poetica, & ipsa, & formis ipsius, quam vim habeat vnaquaeque, & quomodo oporteat componi fabulas, si habitura sit se rectè poesis . . . dicamus.' This translation is Antonio Riccoboni's. It and Isaac Casaubon's edition of the Greek text were printed in parallel columns in the latter's edition of the complete works of Aristotle published in 1590.

There is no reason to doubt that Bacon knew Casaubon's edition—and paid attention to the Latin version. Emil Wolff, in his exhaustive investigation of Bacon's sources, says nothing of the Casaubon edition. He proves, however, that one of Bacon's longest quotations, in Latin, of Aristotle is taken from Valla's translation of the 'Ἡθικὰ Μεγὰλα rather than from the Greek.³ Wolff cites the Frankfort edition of Valla (1593), but it is significant that the Latin version of the 'Ἡθικὰ Μεγὰλα printed in Casaubon's volume is Valla's.

'Quomodo oporteat componi fabulas, si habitura sit se rectè poesis', is, perhaps, as near to a literal translation of the original as one could wish, and it clearly implies that a plot or fable is to be found in everything that is rightly poetry. And quite as striking is a

¹ Aristoteles ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΙΗΤΙΚΗΣ, 76.

² VI, 6.—Gudeman translates this: 'Nun ist aber die nachahmende Darstellung einer Handlung die Fabel. Unter Fabel verstehe ich nämlich die Verknüpfung der Begebenheiten.' Aristoteles über die Dichtkunst, II.

³ Francis Bacon und seine Quellen (Berlin: 1910, 1913), I, 203-4.

later passage, which in Riccoboni's translation reads as follows: 'Manifestum igitur ex his, poetam esse oportere magis fabularum [μύθων] effectorem, quam metrorum, quatenus poeta secundum imitationem est: imitatur autem actiones.'¹

It is true that the chapter in which this appears is principally concerned with a discussion of how poetry differs from history, and therefore statements made in it should be limited in their application; yet it is equally true that sixteenth century critics did not recognize the need for such a limitation. Possibly it was this passage that Jonson had in mind when he wrote:

A Poet is that which by the *Greeks* is call'd κατ' ἐξοχήν, ὁ Ποιητής, a Maker, or a fainer: His Art, an Art of imitation or faining, expressing the life of man in fit measure, numbers, and harmony, according to *Aristotle*: From the word ποιεῖν, which signifies to make or fayne. Hence hee is call'd a *Poet*, not hee which writeth in measure only, but that fayneth and formeth a fable, and writes things like the Truth.²

Jonson evidently ignored the conflict between Aristotle's emphasis on plot and the practice of a large body of lyrical and other plot-less poets. Bacon resolved the conflict by classing the lyric as rhetoric. Goulston, the first English translator of the *Poetics*,³ limited the emphasis. His rendering of the opening passage is:

¹ IX, 9; Casaubon, 377.

² *Timber, or Discoveries*; Spingarn, I, 50.—Probably Jonson had read the version of Daniel Heinsius, which is 'E quib. etiā hoc apparet, poetā magis argumentorū, quā numerorū auctorē esse debere: qā quatenus imitatur, poeta est. Imitatur autē actiones.' *Aristotelis de Poetica Liber* (Leyden: 1611), 21.

Commenting on Jonson's remarks above, Spingarn has more to say on the neo-classical emphasis on plot than I have been able to discover elsewhere. In a passage which explains the drift from the allegorical mode to realism, he writes: 'The neo-classicists, limiting the sense and application of Aristotle's definition of poetry as an imitation of life, regarded the fable as the medium of this imitation, and the more perfect according as it became more truly and more minutely an image of human life. In criticism, therefore, the growth of classicism is more or less coextensive with the growth of the conception of the fable, or plot, as an end in itself.'

'This vaguely defines the change which comes over the spirit of criticism about the beginning of the seventeenth century, and which is exemplified in the writings of Ben Jonson. His definition of poetry [the passage quoted above] does not differ substantially from that of Sidney, but seems more directly Aristotelian.' *Lit. Crit. in the Ren.*, 278.

A better explanation of the decline of allegory, it seems to me, lies in the victory of Aristotle's monistic viewpoint over the dualism of Plato and in the demand for verisimilitude that is implicit throughout the *Poetics*. Certainly Spingarn has not explained why a plot should be looked on as the vehicle for that realism. And it might be observed that the author of 'To Celia' and 'On Salathiel Pavy' would hardly confine himself to fables; hence in the passage immediately ensuing (headed 'What meane you by a Poeme?') we find references to odes, to lyric, elegiac, and epigrammatic poetry. Spingarn, I, 51.

³ Theodore Goulston, *Aristotelis de poetica liber, latine conversus, et analytica methodo illustratus* (London: 1623).

De Arte Poëticâ, & Ipsa in *uniuersum*, & *priuatim* de ipsius SPECIEBV8, Quam Vim *ad prauos affectus expurgandos* habeat vnaquæq; ; Et Quomodo Quibusq; legibus oporteat Componere Fabulas, si habitura sit se rectè Poësis, ex *iisdem Fabulis conflata*: . . . Dicamus.¹

The method preferred by modern commentators is different. While recognizing Aristotle's indifference to the lyric, they give a broad interpretation to 'plot' and the 'action' which it imitates. For instance, Butcher says:

Plot in the drama is the artistic equivalent of 'action' in real life. We have already observed that 'action' in Aristotle is not a purely external act, but an inward process which works outward, the expression of a man's rational personality. Sometimes it is used for 'action' or 'doing' in its strict and limited sense; sometimes for that side of right conduct (*ἐνπραξία*) in which doing is only an element, though the most important. Again, it can denote 'faring' as well as doing; hence, in the drama, where 'action' is represented by the plot, it must include outward fortune and misfortune (*εὐτυχία* and *δυστυχία*). Again, it is used by Aristotle of the processes of the mental life; and lastly, in some contexts it is almost synonymous with *πάθος*.²

We may note also:

The *πρᾶξις* that art seeks to reproduce is an inward process, a psychical energy working outwards; deeds, incidents, events, situations, being included under it so far as these spring from an inward act of will, or elicit some activity of thought or feeling.

Here lies the explanation of the somewhat startling phrase used in the *Poetics*, ch. ii, that 'men acting' are the objects imitated by the fine arts:—by all and not merely dramatic or narrative poetry, where action is more obviously represented. Everything that expresses the mental life, that reveals a rational personality, will fall within this larger sense of 'action'.³

These remarks imply that in Butcher's opinion Aristotle has accounted sufficiently for the lyric. Nowhere, however, does he specifically consider Aristotle's attitude towards the lyric, except for a slight hint in his analysis of the contents of the *Poetics*. According to this analysis, chapter III, which deals with the manner of imitation,

¹ "How and by *what laws* it is necessary to compose fables, if rightly it is to be considered poetry, *when it is made of those same fables*." Goulston's additions to the text are in italics, and it is evident that he realized the implication (and disapproved of it) that a fable was necessary to poetry. André Dacier, on the other hand, anticipates Gudemán by translating the passage thus: 'de montrer de quelle manière il faut constituer un sujet pour faire un bon Poème.' *La Poétique d'Aristote, traduite en français avec des Remarques* (1692), 1.

² *Op. cit.*, 310-11.—Butcher is here referring to Aristotle's use of the word *πρᾶξις* generally, and not merely in the *Poetics*.

³ *Ibid.*, 117.

indicates that 'Poetry may be in form either dramatic narrative, pure narrative (including lyric poetry), or pure drama.'¹ This inclusion of the lyric as a part of pure narrative evidently results from the following:

The poet may imitate by narration—in which case he can either take another personality as Homer does, or speak in his own person unchanged—or he may imitate by making all his actors live and move before us."²

D. L. Clark takes the same view: 'Five kinds of poetry are mentioned by name in the *Poetics*: epic, drama, dithyrambic, nomic, and satiric; and lyric is included by implication as a form of epic, where the poet narrates in his own person';³ and 'Under narrative manner he includes lyric, where the speaker expresses himself in the first person, and epic, where the speaker tells his story in the third person.'⁴

This is certainly a very liberal interpretation, and it completely ignores a subsequent passage in the *Poetics* in which the same point is discussed more fully:

Homer, admirable in all respects, has the special merit of being the only poet who appreciates the part he should take himself. The poet in his own person should speak as little as possible; it is not this that makes him an imitator. Other poets *appear themselves upon the scene throughout, and imitate but little and rarely*. Homer, after a few prefatory words, at once brings in a man, or woman, or other personage; none of them wanting in characteristic qualities, but each with a character of his own.⁵

Appealing though the views of Butcher and Clark may be to moderns, who have an especial regard for subjective art and the representation of mental states, the italicized passage above offers no evidence that Aristotle was at all concerned with the lyric, especially if the passage is placed beside: 'The poet or "maker" should be the maker of plots rather than of verses; since he is a poet because he imitates, and what he imitates are actions.'⁶

¹ *Ibid.*, 1.

² *Poetics*, III, 1. Butcher's translation.

³ *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance*, 10.—'The naming of dithyrambic, nomic, and satiric poetry in the *Poetics* might seem to offset somewhat the emphasis on plot. But they are mentioned merely in passing. (As everyone is aware, the *Poetics* is devoted almost solely to tragedy and the epic, with occasional remarks on comedy.)

⁴ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁵ XXIV, 7. Butcher's translation. The italics are mine.

⁶ IX, 9.—At any rate, Ingram Bywater does not believe that the lyric is implied by the phrase 'in his own person'. He cites a passage in the third book of the *Republic* (392-4), where Plato distinguishes between '(1) simple narration, in

However we may interpret Aristotle to-day, the externality of renaissance criticism must be recognized. It may well be that Aristotle's *πρᾶξις* has the broad meaning which Butcher attaches to it, but it is doubtful if the renaissance theorists interpreted the term in any such manner. For them imitation of an action meant the composing of incidents, the making of a plot, as in the following from Scaliger:

[History and poetry are] two classes [of composition] not at all unlike, which present a common material by means of the common form of narration, and this with much ornament. But they differ, for the one professes to set forth faithfully the truth, weaving its discourse from a simpler thread. The other either adds fictions to facts or imitates facts by means of fictions, using discreetly a greater degree of elaboration. Although, as we have said, both perform the office of narrating, . . . the latter was called Poetry because not only did it reproduce (*vocibus redderet*) those very things that existed, but even represented facts which did not exist, just as if they did, and as they might be or ought to be.¹

Indeed, in one place Scaliger seems to think that imitation is equivalent to representation, for he asserts: 'Aristotle denies that tragic choruses should use antistrophes, for they should engage, not in simple narration, but in imitation.'² This statement seems to be derived from Aristotle's limiting of the choral element in tragedy to *πάροδος* and *στάσιμον*,³ coupled with the following:

The chorus too should be regarded as one of the actors; it should be an integral part of the whole, and share in the action, in the manner not of Euripides but of Sophocles. As for the later poets, their choral songs pertain as little to the subject of the piece as to that of any other tragedy.⁴

which the poet speaks throughout in *propria persona*; (2) imitative or dramatic narration, in which he effaces himself as it were, and speaks in the person of another; and (3) the mixed manner, narrative and dramatic by turns, which we see in Homer.' *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry*, 118. Of the lyric, Bywater says elsewhere, 'The probability is that, from the importance of its musical element, it belonged in Aristotle's classification of the arts to the theory of *μελοποιία* rather than to that of poetry proper.' *Ibid.*, 97.

¹ *Poetices Libri Septem*. I, i; 5th ed., 1617, 2. (—Cf. Tasso: 'La favola, la quale è definita d' Aristotele imitazione dell' azione. . . .' *Discorsi* (Pisa: 1823), II, 20-21.)

² III, xcvi; *ed. cit.*, 333.

³ XII.

⁴ XVIII, 7. Butcher's translation. Here it is evident, Scaliger gives to 'imitation' a very limited meaning. At the same time 'simple narration' possesses a very special signification, especially if we compare its use here with 'Alius in narratione simplici constitit: quale est Lucretij Poema.' Scaliger, I, iii; *ed. cit.*, 12. It would seem that 'simple narration' is narration in the rhetorical sense, which is defined by N.E.D. as 'That part of an oration in which the facts of the matter are stated.' Like other critics of the period, Bacon and Hobbes excepted, Scaliger never came to grips with this matter of plot and imitation. Although he insists that the basis of all poetry is imitation and clearly conceives of imitation in a very literal sense, he speaks thus of the *De Rerum Natura* and also includes in poetry hymns, paeans,

It seems obvious, therefore, that the most learned of the Italian critics found little in the *Poetics* (the title of the treatise is significant since the work is limited to the drama and epic) to suggest that poetry might be highly lyrical or its 'action' of the inward sort that Butcher describes.

If further evidence of the externality of the 'imitation' of renaissance critics is needed, it might be borne in mind that for them the idea of imitation began with Plato's remarkably lucid and persuasive explanation of the function of the painter (and poet) in the tenth book of the *Republic* (595-608). There the artist was represented as imitating the external appearance of actual objects. With an enthusiasm for poetry which could not brook the sentiments in the celebrated polemic against poets, the renaissance critics welcomed Aristotle's *Poetics* as an exposition which amplified Plato's point of view and so justified poetry. Where Plato's poet imitated objects, Aristotle's imitated men in action; and where Plato's poet merely duplicated the external world as by a mirror, with all of its faults and at a third remove from reality, Aristotle's poet was more philosophical than a historian (who imitates in the Platonic sense) because he idealizes and improves upon the world as it reveals itself to sense.

That Scaliger at least regarded the external world as the source of materials for imitation is revealed in the following passage, in which is to be found convincing evidence of the way in which a synthesis was made of Plato and Aristotle:

Thus far we have shown by means of examples from Virgil how the ideas of things were taken from nature herself. Indeed I consider that it is with his poetry as it is with painting.¹ For sculptors and those who use colours take from actual reality (*ipsis rebus*) the conceptions by which they imitate lineaments, light, shade, and background. Whatever they find most excellent in objects severally they transfer from many sources into one work of their own, so that they seem not to have parted from nature but to have vied with her, or rather, indeed, to have given her laws. For who would think that the beauty of any one woman was ever such that something in it might not be found lacking by a critic? For although there is a pattern in nature herself, and universal perfection in her dimensions, nevertheless in the individual case mixed parentage, time, climate, and place bring many impediments.²

But to return to Bacon's and Hobbes's analyses of the nature of songs, odes, scolia, satires, nuptial songs, elegies, monodies, incantations, and epigrams, as well as epic and drama. I, iii; *ed. cit.*, 13.

¹ Perhaps merely the renaissance commonplace, "Ut pictura poesis", is sufficient to prove the externality of sixteenth century criticism.

² III, xxiv; *ed. cit.*, 258-59.

poetry after a considerable excursus on the importance of plot in renaissance criticism generally and the externality of the action that it imitated, we note that both philosophers have something to say concerning verse-making as a mark of the poet. Neither considers that verse is fundamental. Bacon, after making his famous pronouncement that poetic expression 'is but a *Character* of stile, and belongeth to Arts of speeche,' asserts that with respect to its subject matter, poetry 'is nothing else but **FAINED HISTORY** which may be stiled as well in Prose as in Verse.'¹ Hobbes, on the other hand, favours verse, but it is not an absolute essential:

They that give entrance to Fictions writ in Prose err not so much [as those who admit Empedocles, Lucretius, etc., to the roll of poets], but they err: For Prose requireth delightfulness, not onely of fiction, but of stile, in which, if Prose contend with Verse, it is with disadvantage and, as it were, on foot against the strength and wings of *Pegasus*.²

It is true that both Bacon and Hobbes would seem to make subject matter the test of poetry when the former insists that the matter of poetry is feigned history and the latter that the 'subject of a poem is the manners of men.' But since in both cases this subject matter must be presented as a story, it is clear that form is quite as important. Certainly Aristotle gives the same impression with his various remarks concerning 'how it is necessary to compose the fables if the poetry is to be of a good kind', 'imitation of an action', and 'men in action',³ and only a broad interpretation such as Butcher's will give a satisfactory basis for concluding that poetry may have an expository form, in other words, that it need not be constructed with a sequence of events as the framework.

It will be observed that both Bacon and Hobbes introduce their comments on verse in close connection with the matter of feigned history of the represented manners of men. This is natural, and of course ultimately derives from a similar close association in a section of the *Poetics*, where we read:

The poet and the historian differ not by writing in verse or in prose. The work of Herodotus might be put into verse, and it would still be a species of history, with metre no less than without it. The true difference is that one relates what has happened, the other what may happen.⁴

¹ Spingarn, I, 5.

² *Ibid.*, II, 56.

³ The last two refer primarily to drama, but the well-known neo-classical tendency to refer all types of poetry (even painting and sculpture) to a single formula, shows that few distinctions of this sort were then drawn. Even closer to our own time, Lessing held the view that poetry should be an imitation of external action.

⁴ IX, 2. Butcher's translation.

But there is another passage in the *Poetics* which, in the form in which it was accepted during the Renaissance, must have added greatly to the confusion concerning Aristotle's pronouncements on the importance of verse and which as a result must have contributed greatly to the importance with which plot was regarded and, indeed, to the common belief that the prose romance was an epic. In *Poetics* I, 6, near the beginning, where even the least diligent student could not miss it, we read in Casaubon's edition:

ἡ δὲ ἐποποιία μόνον τοῖς λόγοις ψιλοῖς, ἢ τοῖς μέτροις· καὶ τούτοις εἴτε μινύσσει μετ' ἀλλήλων, εἴθ' ἐνὶ τινὶ γένει χρωμένη, τῶν μέτρων τυγχάνουσα μέχρι τοῦ νῦν· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἂν ἔχοιμεν ὀνομάσαι κοινὸν τοὺς Σώφρονος καὶ Ξενάρχου μίμους, καὶ τοὺς Σωκρατικούς λόγους· οὐδὲ εἴ τις διὰ τριμέτρων, ἢ ἐλεγείων, ἢ τῶν ἄλλων τινῶν τῶν τοιοῦτων ποιοῖτο τὴν μίμησιν·

Riccoboni's translation of this passage is:

Epopœia verò solum sermonibus nudis, vel metris, & his siue mixtis inter se, siue vno aliquo genere vtens metrorū: qualis fuit vsque adhuc. Non enim rem communē possemus nominare Sophronis, & Xenarchi mimos, & Socratis sermones. Neq. si quis per Trimetra, vel Elegos, vel alia quaedam talia conficeret imitationē.¹

In other words, 'The epic uses either bare words or metres'. Butcher's rendering of this passage reads:

The art [for *epic*] which imitates by means of language alone, and that either in prose or verse—which verse, again, may either combine different metres or consist of but one kind—has hitherto been without a name.² For there is no common term we could apply to the mimes of Sophron and Xenarchus and to the Socratic dialogues; or again to poetic imitations in iambic, elegiac, or any similar metre.

This translation is based on a text which, except for punctuation and the omission of ἐποποιία and the addition of ἀνώνυμος is virtually the same as Casaubon's. Now the word ἐποποιία in the Greek text appears in the Parisian MS (1741), the A^o, which once was generally supposed to be the archetype from which all other MSS were derived, and doubt was not cast on the authenticity of the word until the latter part of the last century as a result of the study of Arabic texts.

Clearly the presence of ἐποποιία in this passage is very confusing, and it has occasioned much comment by the students of Aristotle, but not, it would seem, by writers on sixteenth and seventeenth century criticism. The case for its exclusion as put by Bywater is

¹ *Ibid.*, 374.

² Modern texts add ἀνώνυμος before τυγχάνουσα.

that the presence of the word makes the thought in Chapter VI inconsistent with that in Chapters IV and V, in which poetry, music, and dancing are said to imitate by means of rhythm, language, and harmony, either singly or combined, and in which examples of the various methods are given with the exception of 'the art which imitates by means of language alone.'¹ Additional and rather obvious evidence of inconsistency is provided by the immediately ensuing text, where mimes and Socratic dialogues, it would seem, are epics, and where the expression 'epic (that is, hexameter) poets' appears. 'Εποποιία, if allowed to stand, is also contradictory to Aristotle's clear-cut statements elsewhere that a single metre, which of course is the hexameter, is always to be used by the epic poets: 'Epic poetry admits but one kind of metre,'² and 'As to that poetic imitation which is narrative in form and employs a single metre. . . .'³

As has been indicated, doubt was not cast on the troublesome word ἐποποιία until fairly recent years. Its presence caused Goulston some concern, however, for his amplified version reads:

Εποποιία verò, nec Numero imitatur, nec Harmoniâ, sed solùm Sermonibus Nudis, siue appellare malumus, Metris: Et Metris, ità vt aut Plura eorum genera permiscuerit inter se, (quod aliæ Imitationes faciunt;) aut Vno aliquo Metrorum genere vsa sit, sc: Hexametro: quod, à priscis temporibus, ad nostrum vsque factitatum est.⁴ Nisi .n. Imitatio per Sermones vel Metra dicatur, nullum haberemus Commune Nomen, quo appellari possent Sophronis atque Xenarchi Mimi, & Socratis Fabellae alternis versibus conscriptae;

As with *fables* in the first sentence of the *Poetics*, Goulston again

¹ Aristotle on the Art of Poetry, 105-6. In 1559, Minturno used somewhat the same logic to simplify the matter for his contemporaries. Retaining ἐποποιία, he changed *bare words* to *bare verses*: 'Ex poetis autem nudis uersibus, hoc est, uerbis, ac numeris sine cantu, ac dēpta saltatione epici exprimūt que susceperunt.' *De Poeta*, 26. For other discussions than Bywater's of the omission of ἐποποιία and the closely related addition of ἀνώνυμος see also Joh. Vahlen, *Beiträge zu Aristoteles' Poetik*, ed. H. Schöne (Berlin: 1914), 243, and A. O. Prickard, *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry* (London: 1891), 98-100. Vahlen approves of the omission of ἐποποιία; Prickard does not, claiming that the mimes of Sophron and Xenarchus and certain 'Socratic' dialogues may have been in verse. An interesting and complete summation of the matter as it stood before these revisions of the text were proposed is to be found in Thomas Twining's *Aristotle's Treatise on Poetry* (London: 1812), I, 229-47.

² V, 4.—Here and elsewhere Aristotle uses the word ἐποποιία, and except in the one troublesome sentence it can mean only on thing, the epic.

³ XXX, 1.—This chapter is exclusively on the epic.

⁴ He here introduces a marginal note: "Digressio de Appellatione Εποποιæ. Que nisi ex hoc loco admitatur; nulla reperietur communis vox ad mimos & fabulas:"

detected an inconsistency. Because of his inability to construe 'ad nostrum usque' satisfactorily and also because Aristotle elsewhere indicated that epics used 'vno aliquo Metrorum genere,' he inserted '*Hexametro factitatum est*'. Similarly the presence of *ἐποποιία* compelled him to render the sentence containing 'either in prose or in verse' with 'sed solum Sermonibus Nudis, siue *appellare malumus, Metris*'. It is true that, unlike Bacon, Goulston, here and in the passage examined previously, amplified rather than limited Aristotle's meaning, but even so it is clear that for him Aristotle's bare statements implied on the one hand that a fable was necessary to poetry and on the other that the epic might be in either prose or verse. Of course at a time when every word supposedly written by the master was sacred, no matter how confusing, it never occurred to him that *ἐποποιία* might be deleted.¹

Bacon's method was different. An acknowledged opponent of Aristotle and of the scholastic method of explaining away any seeming faults and inconsistencies, he would hardly bother with a justification of the contradictions of the *Poetics*. His opposition to the idol of the schoolmen, however, did not prevent his taking from Aristotle certain isolated principles, provided, of course, that they fitted into his own system. As set forth by Kuno Fischer, that system made poetry one of the divisions of learning, a division in which the human mind reflected the external world and not the inner impulses of the human spirit. It was for this reason, Fischer says, that Bacon banished lyric poetry to the realm of rhetoric.²

Fischer's analysis is not entirely satisfactory, however. After quoting, in German translation, a passage in the *De Augmentis* as follows:

Deshalb kann die Poesie mit Recht als etwas Göttliches erscheinen, weil sie Abbilder der Dinge unserm Wunsche gemäss erscheinen lässt und

¹ Heinsius expresses his veneration of Aristotle explicitly. His note on the passage in question is: 'Ab omnibus vexatus est iste locus . . . Ostendit autem eruditissimus magister, Philosophum esse dominum verborum: id quod etiam toties proficitur Plato. Nam ut aliquod statuatur eorum genus, quæ τῷ λόγῳ μόνον imitantur, ἐποποιίας vocem eiusque usum latius extendit.' *Op. cit.*, 70. Dacier's translation of the passage is interesting also: 'L'Epopée se sert du discours en prose ou en vers, soit qu'elle mêle plusieurs sortes de vers ou qu'elle se contente d'une seule espece, comme elle l'a fait jusqu'à present. Je donne au mot Epopée une signification fort étendue: car autrement nous n'aurions pas de mot général qui comprît les Mimes de Sophron, & ceux de Xenarchus, les dialogues de Socrate & toutes les autres imitations qu'on pourroit faire soit en vers iambes, ou en vers élégiaques, ou en quelque autre sorte de vers.' *Op. cit.*, 2-3.

² Francis Bacon und seine Schule, 3rd ed. (Heidelberg: 1904), 187.

nicht unsern Geist den Dingen unterwirft, was Vernunft und Geschichte verlangen,"¹

he adds:

Demnach ist unter dem baconischen Gesichtspunkte die Poesie das Abbild der Welt nicht bloss in, sondern auch nach unserm Geiste: das Abbild der Welt, dargestellt unter den Idolen der Phantasie. Also hier erscheint die Poesie nur als Spiegel der Welt, nicht als Spiegel der menschlichen Seele, nur als Abbild der Geschichte, nicht als Abbild des eigenen Gemüths. Es giebt mit andern Worten für Bacon keine lyrische Poesie.²

Although this statement does full justice to the externality of Bacon's point of view and no doubt justly in view of Bacon's expression 'rerum simulacrum,' it may be observed that any art which rebuilds the world closer to the heart's desire may be said to reflect the soul of man, whether it be lyrical or narrative or dramatic. Although Fischer asserts that Bacon's interest in the allegorical interpretation of Greek tales led to the inclusion of poetry as one of the divisions of learning,³ a partial explanation of Bacon's attitude, then, lies in the way in which poetry fitted into his own system and in his own lack of sympathy for what we now recognize as the essential spirit of poetry, a lack of sympathy that was doubtless increased by the dominance of dramatic and narrative poetry in England at the time.⁴ But for a complete explanation we must turn to the implications with respect to plot which he found in the text of the *Poetics* that was accepted in his day.

Of Hobbes's definition of poetry, little need be added to what has been said of Bacon's. For proof that Hobbes was indebted to Bacon for his division of poetry into three kinds each of which contained a plot, no more evidence is required than what is supplied

¹ II, 13: 'Quare et merito etiam divinitatis cuiuspiam particeps videri possit; quia animum erigit et in sublime rapit, rerum simulacra ad animi desideria accommodando, non animum rebus (quod ratio facit, et historia) submittendo.' *Works*, I, 519.

² Fischer, *ibid.*, 187.

³ *Ibid.*, 185.—So far as I am aware, no one has related Bacon's division of learning into history, philosophy, and poetry with Sidney's insistence that these three are competitors for the crown of most effectively inculcating a love of virtue in mankind. Cf. *An Apology for Poetry*, G. G. Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays* (Oxford: 1904), especially I, 162ff. As a matter of fact the recognition of poetry as a division of learning can be traced in England as far back as *The Scholemaster*, in which poetry heads a list that includes history, philosophy, and oratory. (Smith, *ibid.*, 26.) Nor does it appear that Bacon's insistence on plot has been referred to Sidney's statement that the *Cyropædia* and *Theagenes and Cariclea*, though in prose, are heroic poems. (*Ibid.*, 160.) Sidney, of course, does not reject the minor forms of poetry.

⁴ It is worth noting that in Aristotle's day a similar situation existed, which must have contributed to his indifference to the lyric.

by the passages themselves. Hobbes's substitution of scommatic poetry for Bacon's parabolical can be readily explained. Concerned with all the divisions of learning, Bacon set up a system in which poetry was coördinate with philosophy and history, and naturally allegory, a most edifying form of literary composition, had its place. On the other hand, Hobbes, the political philosopher, saw the world divided into the court, the city, and the country, to which the heroic, scommatic, and pastoral (each either narrative or dramatic) corresponded. Aware also, perhaps, that the parabolic or allusive method might also be used in the epic and drama, and that Bacon's categories therefore were not mutually exclusive, he fell into a similar confusion by substituting the scommatic. Perhaps, too, with respect to allegory, he was a greater realist than Bacon. At any rate the fundamental principle of his 'Answer to Davenant' is the greater the verisimilitude, the greater the edification.

Hobbes's insistence on verse represented no very daring or original point of view. He was greatly preoccupied with style, as is evidenced by his preparation of an abstract of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in 1637 and by the elaborate analyses of style which appear in both his 'Answer to Davenant' and the preface to the *Odyssey* (1675). In both of these, great attention is given to propriety and 'decency'. Since poetry for the most part deals with elevated subjects, an elevated style, to which metre contributes, is appropriate: When afterwards the majestie of that stile [the style of hymns composed by prophets and priests] was observed, the Poets chose it as best becoming their high invention.¹

The importance of the limitation of poetry to that which possesses a plot will have greater or less significance according to one's demand for definite evidence of later acceptance of the principle. It must be admitted that no other specific statement appears in which lyrical and other minor forms are said not to be poetry.² Yet, that the emphasis on construction which dominates seventeenth century criticism was an outgrowth of the emphasis on plot can readily be inferred. Jonson's interest in construction is owing to a considerable extent, no doubt, to the Aristotelianism that he discovered in Heinsius, but his admiration for Bacon and the *Advancement of Learning*, expressed

¹ 'Answer to Davenant'. Spingarn, II, 56.

² In another place even Hobbes is much less specific. The *Leviathan* contains this incomplete repetition of what appears in the 'Answer to Davenant': 'In a good poem, whether it be *epic* or *dramatic*; as also in *sonnets*, *epigrams* and other pieces, both judgment and fancy are required.' *Works*, Molesworth ed., 1839, III, 58.

more than once in *Timber, or Discoveries*,¹ suggests that Bacon's pronouncement was not without its importance. Similarly Hobbes must have contributed something to Dryden's preoccupation with poetry that possesses a plot, equally in his critical and his creative work. Both are devoted principally to dramatic and narrative poetry; the latter either epic or satirical. Dryden's first two critical essays, the 'Epistle Dedicatory of the *Rival Ladies*' (1664) and the 'Preface to *Annus Mirabilis*' (1666) are a tissue of expressions from Davenant's 'Preface to *Gondibert*' and Hobbes's 'Answer' and *Humane Nature*; and his critical works to the end of his life are filled with similar echoes.²

The decline of the lyrical impulse in the Restoration period is usually looked on as a reaction from earlier extravagance, a Hegelian interpretation with whom no one can quarrel, least of all those who have read Davenant's 'Preface' and Hobbes's 'Answer'. But at a time when criticism turned completely rational, whether neo-classical or not, the definitions of poetry set forth by England's two most prominent philosophers must have had their effect, especially since they were in accord with the ever increasing Aristotelianism of the age.

And to this one might add that whatever influence the statements of Bacon and Hobbes may have had on their successors, the concern with form and especially with dramatic and narrative form is illustrative of how nicely the problems of the disposition of the fable lent themselves to the rationalistic criticism of the seventeenth century. The three unities and the construction which began *in medias res* could be worked out in narrative and dramatic poetry with almost mathematical exactness. Since similar methods could not so well be applied to poetry that possessed an expository form, the virtual ignoring of the latter type by the critics is not difficult to understand.

¹ Cf. Spingarn, I, 27, 42.

² Two references to Hobbes by name appear in the 'Preface to the *Fables*' (1700). W. P. Ker, *Essays of John Dryden* (Oxford: 1926), II, 248, 252. And other passages in this last (and nearly the greatest) critical effort of Dryden are reminiscent of Hobbes.

THE TEXT OF TROLLOPE'S *PHINEAS REDUX*

By R. W. CHAPMAN

In *The Review of English Studies* for January 1941 I sought to show two things. The first, that Trollope's hand was illegible, I based on the evidence of one short letter of his, written in 1870, and formerly in my possession. The second, that his hand puzzled the printer of his posthumous *Autobiography*, I proved (up to a point) by adducing certain passages in that book which, as printed in 1883, do not conform to the holograph preserved in the British Museum, and clearly are not due to editorial change made on the proofs. I now make a bold leap, and submit evidence that Trollope was, in one of his later publications, a careless or at least a fallible proofreader.

A year or two ago I published in the *Times Literary Supplement* a few conjectures in the text of *Phineas Redux*. I have since amused a tedious convalescence by reading the book again, slowly and suspiciously. In the same period I have re-read all the Barchester novels and all the Palliser novels. My impression is confirmed and enhanced that the text of *Phineas Redux* is seriously faulty and is worse than the text of any of the novels with which I am equally familiar.

The evidence of the *Autobiography*¹, I now find, makes this natural enough. Trollope sailed for Australia in May 1871.² He left behind him, 'in a strong box', the MS. of *Phineas Redux*.³ He got home in December 1872 (319), and 'settled myself down to hunting from London three days a week'. This meant a cab at 7 A.M. or earlier, and an effort to get back and dine at 8.⁴ In the course of 1873 he moved into a new house in Montagu Square and faced 'the labour of a new catalogue' of his library.⁵ When Trollope says labour he means labour. In this year he published *The Eustace Diamonds*, *Lady Anna*, and *Australia and New Zealand*⁶ and began *The Way We*

¹ I confess with regret that I have read neither of Mr. Michael Sadleir's books on Trollope.

² *Autobiography*, reprint in *World's Classics*, 313.

³ *Ibid.*, 315.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 320.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 322.

Live Now. He also wrote a Christmas story for the *Graphic*. Then, still in 1873, he 'returned with a full heart to Lady Glencora and her husband'—that is, began *The Prime Minister*.¹

Yet *Phineas Redux* was not forgotten. It ran in the *Graphic* from 19 July 1873 to 10 January 1874. Whether Trollope had the proofs in batches or once a week I do not know. It may be significant that the worst errors fall in the second volume; in November and December Trollope was trying to emulate the exploits of Phineas and Chiltern, and was risking his neck three times a week.²

I present, then, a number of passages in which I think it legitimate to suspect the text. For most of these I suggest a remedy. I am not wedded to my conjectures, though some of them I think must be right, and many more may well be right. But in the textual criticism of modern authors the first step—and not seldom the most difficult step—has been taken when corruption has been shown to be certain or probable. The cure may then be sought at leisure.

It will be seen that I make bold to doubt many passages which I admit may be sound. To many this will seem perverse. 'Why,' they will ask, 'cannot the fellow leave well alone?' But this attitude assumes a canon of criticism which, if it is applied to modern texts, is radically false. For arrant nonsense seldom gets through; someone will correct it, somehow, though perhaps not in accordance with the author's original script. But the plausible mis-reading, the reading that makes sense *prima facie*, is just the reading that will satisfy the printer and, very likely, elude the author's vigilance when he reads his proof. Let no one imagine that busy authors check their proofs with their manuscript. I concede, however, that the attempt to detect such error is a wild-goose chase unless it has been in general established that the text of a book is faulty. The candid reader will find, I believe, that a good case has been made out against *Phineas Redux*.

Except for the few passages formerly discussed in the *Times Literary Supplement* I have had no means of verifying that the text of the *World's Classics* edition (to the volumes and pages of which I refer) reproduces faithfully the text which Trollope supervised. It will be seen, however, that most of the errors assumed are not such as

¹ *Autobiography*, reprint in *World's Classics*, 326.

² Since my general impression was formed I have re-read *Lady Anna*. This novel was written on the voyage to Australia, and was published in the *Fortnightly*, April 1873 to April 1874. The *Fortnightly* had already become a monthly, and the conditions may have been more favourable to careful proof-reading than those of publication in the weekly *Graphic*. However that may be, the text of *Lady Anna* strikes me as sound; I have noted very few passages which seem suspicious.

are readily made by a careful printer setting up from a printed text. I think one may be confident that the Oxford printer is seldom at fault.

I have no reason to believe that the manuscript has survived. I had it on good authority, about two years ago, that so far as was known none of Trollope's novels had survived in manuscript. But I have since noted that one of them has been in the market. If the manuscript of *Phineas Redux* is extant,¹ it will be interesting to see what becomes of these my hariations.

I have done what I thought I could to make this article readable by quoting or describing the context of the more interesting passages. But I can hardly hope that it will be found intelligible even by ardent Trollopians, unless it may tempt them to read again one of the most brilliant—if it is also one of the most sprawling—of his narratives of English life.

I

- I 19 *There had been passages in their first lives which people cannot forget. Perhaps first for former* (i.e. the lives of Phineas and Chiltern before Phineas disappeared into the Irish fog at the end of *Phineas Finn*) may stand; if it is wrong, I think of no better substitute than *joint*.
- I 41 *Mr. Molescroft, whose hours were pressing, soon took his leave.* Very well; time *presses*, and so forth. But it might be *precious*.
- I 54 *House* should be *house*.
- I 55 *the consternation felt among Mr. Daubeny's friends was infinitely greater than that which fell among his enemies.* Consternation may fall, like a thunderbolt. But the balance is wrong; one should expect the more picturesque term to be applied to the greater panic. Possibly *that felt*, or *that which was felt*, or *what was felt*.
- I 62 *'Deary me, and it is a thing for sore eyes to have you back again.'* This may be an old-fashioned form of the familiar phrase *a sight for sore eyes*. But I suspect *thing*, or a word like it, elsewhere. See I 146 and 286 (*things*), I 149 (*think*).
- I 68 Lady Laura says that her father, exiled in Dresden, *'does—nothing. He reads the English papers, and talks of English parties, is driven out, and eats his dinner, and sleeps.'* I do not think *parties* can be social occasions, and I doubt if political parties can be meant, unless the has dropped out before *English*; there were only two parties. If a correction is needed, *politics* is easy.
- I 76 *'Lord Chiltern,' said Miss Palliser, seriously; 'I will never again speak to you a word on any subject except hunting.'* Miss Palliser's thoughts were serious enough, but her tone was that of banter. I think she said *'Lord Chiltern! Seriously, I will never'* etc.

¹ Since this was written I learn that it is in America.

THE TEXT OF TROLLOPE'S PHINEAS REDUX 187

- I 86 *Mr. Daubeny's words had of course been more fluent, but the gist of the expression expressed was the same.* This looks rather like a 'doublet'; perhaps Trollope wrote *gist expressed* and substituted of *the expression* above the line, failing to erase *expressed*.
- I 87 *Another gentleman . . . seconded the Address, and declared that in nothing was the sagacity of a Legislature so necessary as in discussing the period in which that which had hitherto been good ceased to be serviceable.* It was common ground that Disestablishment must come; the only question was when. This was certainly matter for discussion; but perhaps Trollope wrote *discerning*.
- I 88, 359 Mr. Gresham, indignant at Mr. Daubeny's insolence in stealing his thunder, and introducing a bill to disestablish the Church of England, twice misquotes a well-worn Virgilian line: *Quo nimium reis, Graiâ pandetur ab urbe.* *Quo nimium* for *Quod minimum* is not merely a misquotation; it is nonsense. I was formerly of opinion that, since it occurs twice, it must be an aberration of Trollope's. (I once wrote, and read, in a lecture to the English Association, *monstro digitari* for *digito monstrari*; neither I nor, so far as I noticed, my audience batted an eyelid.) But it is possible that a compositor, or a printer's reader, having got it wrong once, might remember it. Trained readers have a remarkable memory even for what they do not understand.
- I 93 *But there were a few men in the House, and some out of it, who regarded Mr. Monk as the honestest and most patriotic politician of the day.* Mr. Monk was a popular leader who had compromised his position by accepting office, and had not yet recovered it by his resignation of office. But he still had a following in the country. I should like to read *more* for *some*.
- I 122 l. 6 *friends* should probably be *friend*.
- I 136 *cemented action* is no doubt possible of a body of politicians; but probably Trollope wrote *concerted*.
- I 137 *There remains of it . . . some traces.* Either *remain*, or *trace*.
- I 146 *'As for Planty Pall, he and I belong so essentially to different orders of things, that we can hardly be reckoned as being both men'.* Lord Chiltern is not saying that the heir to a dukedom and the heir to an earldom are in different social orders, but that their characters and habits are different; one cares only for decimal coinage, the other only for foxes. Perhaps *things* should be *beings*; the jingle, *beings . . . being*, would not worry our author.
- I 149 Lord Chiltern asks his wife why she had refused him so often. *'I don't know. I never could tell. It wasn't that I didn't dote upon you, and think about you, and feel quite sure that there never could be any other one than you.'*—*think*, following *dote*, is deplorable anticlimax; *dream* would do, but does not seem graphically probable. Could it be *sigh*? See above, I 62, where I suggest *sight* for *thing*.
- I 156 *The shame of running away from the man seemed to be a worse evil than the shame of meeting him.* Madame Goesler was in two minds. In the end she decided not to run away. But the argument is con-

- fused. I think that either (1) *worse* is a misreading of *lesser* or (2) some word or words indicating the transition should be supplied, e.g. *Then, the shame* etc. There may be a larger lacuna.
- I 157 *The condition of Phineas Finn was almost as bad* (as Madame Goesler's), *but he had a much less protracted period of anticipation . . . There could be no question of his running away . . . But it may be doubted whether his dismay was not even more than hers.* It may be pedantic to see inconsistency in this, as in the previous passage. But if Trollope wrote *at least as bad*, *at least* might easily be read as *almost*.
- I 165-6 *Two roads intersected each <other> on the middle of Copperhouse Common—a simple haplography.* So II 183 perhaps any <other> of the rising men.
- I 166 *the hounds sat stately on their haunches where riflemen actually are used to kneel to fire.* I do not understand *actually*. Prof. Sutherland suggests *annually*, which seems very probable. Volunteers no doubt then, as later, held their exercises every summer.
- I 222 *Mr. Maule senior had ill-used his wife* (who died young), *and had continued a long-continued liaison with a complaisant friend.* This seems intolerable, but I see no solution.
- I 225 *Mr. Maule senior was barely on speaking terms with his son.* On this occasion the son called on the father by appointment, and asked if he might light a cigar. This was refused, but a cigarette *was reluctantly offered, and accepted with a shrug.* 'But you didn't come home merely to smoke, I dare say'. It is not in Mr. Maule's manner to treat his chambers as his son's *home*. He may be ironical; but I suspect he said *come here*.
- I 284 *Mr. Quintus Slide was at his office from nine in the evening till any hour in the morning at which he might be able to complete The People's Banner for that day's use.* For use read *issue*?
- I 286 *An editor is bound to avoid the meshes of the law, which are always infinitely more costly to companies, or things, or institutions, than they are to individuals.* Here, as elsewhere, I suspect the word *things*. See above, I 62, 146, 149.
- I 288 *Mr. Slide really believed he had a vocation to support British morals by exposing scandals in high places. That such details will make a paper 'pay' Mr. Slide knew also; but it is only in Mr. Slide's path of life that the bias of a man's mind may lead him to find that virtue and profit are compatible.* Read *is it* (interrogative) or *it is <not>*.
- I 305 *'A wife may be excused for having a mad husband.'* Lady Laura's venial offence was that she had run away—as far as Dresden—from her husband. For *having* read *leaving*.
- I 341 *'He cannot bear to think that my position should be withheld from me by Mr. Kennedy while I have done nothing wrong.'* Lady Laura is reporting her father's grievance against her husband. Now what Lord Brentford could not bear was that Kennedy had appropriated his wife's £40,000. For *position* read *fortune*.

- I 343 *There would be the Duke,—the Duke of St. Bungay, who had for years past been 'the Duke' when Liberal administrations were discussed, and the same Duke, whom we know so well; and Sir Harry Coldfoot . . . and the rest of them.* This is a list of the probable leading members of Mr. Gresham's government then forming, and must include the Duke of Omnium. The text may be sound, for Trollope sometimes closes a parenthesis with a comma, not a dash; so the old Duke ends at *discussed*, and *the same Duke, whom we know so well* is 'Planty Pall,' who has lately succeeded his uncle as Duke of Omnium. But I should like to believe that Trollope wrote (1) *There would be the Dukes* (2) *and the other (or the young) Duke, whom we know so well*; he often distinguishes the younger statesman and his Nestor in this sort of way.
- I 367 *one person said to another, as they sat together at their club.* The context suggests that Trollope wrote *parson*.
- I 383 *Mr. Gresham pronounced a eulogy on Plantagenet Palliser, so graceful and well arranged, that even the bitterness of the existing Opposition was unable to demur to it.* Mr. Gresham was leader of the Opposition, which was indeed bitter against Mr. Daubeney, but had no reason to be bitter against so honoured a Liberal as Mr. Palliser. I think we should understand *opposition* (no capital) as abstract not concrete.
- I 391 l. 17 *has* should be *had*.
- I 408 *'You're going to be Privy Seal, and to work just the same as ever at those horrible two farthings'.* Lady Glencora, now Duchess of Omnium, is jeering at her unhappy Duke, who cannot, as such, be Chancellor of the Exchequer, but is anxious to resume his slavery in the cause of decimal coinage. She was the least accurate of her sex; but even she must have known that the essence of her husband's dream was that the shilling should contain 50 farthings, the penny five farthings; 'five farthings' is the motto of his political life; *five* could easily be misread as *two*.
- I 429, l. 9 from foot, *form* should perhaps be *join*.

II

- II 19 line 11 *curiosity* does not seem the right word. Chiltern is telling his friend that there is no cause for quarrelling. Perhaps *animosity*? But the text may be sound.
- II 25 *Having done so much, of course she clung heartily to the side which she had adopted;—and equally, of course, Madame Goesler did the same.* Modern punctuation, at least, requires *and, equally of course,—* Trollope did not mean 'equally the same'.
- II 29 *'a gentleman now well known in the political world.'* Kennedy had been in the Cabinet; but he had been on the shelf for some time and was *now* mad. For *now* read *once*.
- II 29 *'we are of opinion that the moral feeling of the country would have been served by the publication.'* Mr. Quintus Slide was a very low-class

journalist, but not without a sense of style. Some word like *well-being* would be more natural than *feeling*.

- II 63 '*There is Mr. Monk;—ask him*'. I suspect that this is not Finn's advice to Erle, but Erle's to Finn. It is Finn who asks Monk's advice in the following paragraphs.
- II 64 *He could not allow Mr. Bonteen to have the last word, especially as a certain amount of success had seemed to attend them.* I suppose we must read *words*.
- II 100 *a tailor was produced who gave it as his opinion that Finn's coat had been lately worn with the collar raised.* I remark in passing that Trollope seems to have forgotten this very interesting clue, of which I find no mention at the trial.
- II 118 '*I think I can control my heart. But my fortune has been kind to me, and I have never been tempted.*' The second *my* is possibly due to accidental repetition.
- II 123 It was intimated that the managers of Mr. Kennedy's estate were by no means anxious of embarrassing their own duty by so trumpery an additional matter as the income derived from Lady Laura's forty thousand pounds. O.E.D. quotes *anxious* of only once, 1735, and that of an issue dreaded. Perhaps *desirous*.
- II 162 *The external circumstances of his position were as comfortable as circumstances would allow.* Dreadful! but Trollope is often shocking. On p. 164 *committed* (a crime) and *committed* (for trial) come within eight words of each other.
- II 174 '*kept in this room*'. *Kept* should perhaps be *left* as on p. 175; but *kept* may be Mrs. Meager's cockney.
- II 175 *There is, however, enough ample evidence that . . .* Perhaps Trollope substituted *ample* for *enough* and failed to erase the rejected word. *is* should rather be *was*.
- II 180 *Madame Goesler thought that much could be done if that coat were found and the maker of a secret key were present.* In the event the Czech who made the key was found in Bohemia and produced at the Old Bailey. But as yet Madame Goesler had not got further than a strong suspicion that a key had been made in Prague. I am tempted to read if . . . *the making of a secret key were proven*. But probably I had better leave well alone.
- II 181 '*Greek and German*'. *Greek* should be *Czech*, as at 282.
- II 189 'The Old Duke (St. Bungay) has expounded (188) the doctrine that though our very broad aristocracy is not precisely divided, nevertheless there is one glory of the sun and another of the moon, and the success of our order (and, 189, the success of the Liberal party) depends chiefly on the conduct of the greatest and richest. This doctrine he proceeds to apply: when the Duke of Omnium died, his Garter was given by Mr. Gresham not to his nephew, our Young Duke, but to a mere baron. '*Lord Cantrip is my friend, almost as warmly as are you; but the country would not have missed the ribbon from the breast of Lord Cantrip*'. Now the warmth of the Old Duke's friendship for Lord Cantrip (or Lord Cantrip's for him)

is not relevant; the argument is that the Duke of Omnium is entitled to the Garter in virtue of his dukedom and his wealth. I submit that *warmly* is a corruption of *worthy* (and, with less confidence, would rewrite the sentence thus: *Lord Cantrip is, my friend, almost as worthy as you are*. The Old Duke twice, in the context, calls the Young Duke *my friend*). The main point is that though the two noblemen were almost equally meritorious, there should be no 'damned merit' about the Garter. The Old Duke would have recoiled from the expression, but that was his sentiment. Just below, *sent* should perhaps be *given*.

- II 189-190 The Old Duke tells the Young Duke that he would have had the Garter '*had you been more the Duke, and less the slave of your country*'. The Young Duke replies that his only ambition is '*to be the serviceable slave of my country*'.

Old Duke. '*A man is more serviceable than a slave.*'

Young Duke. '*No; no; I deny it. . . . The politician who becomes the master of his country sinks from the statesman to the tyrant.*'

Old Duke. '*We misunderstand each other, my friend. Pitt, and Peel, and Palmerston, were not tyrants, though each assumed . . . the mastery of which I speak.*'

The antithesis of *man* and *slave* may pass in itself; but it is irrelevant, and not calculated to provoke the Young Duke's indignant *denial*. Moreover, as the text stands, the Old Duke's final speech is in the air; for he has spoken of no *mastery*. We must, I think, read '*A master is more serviceable than a slave*'.

The Old Duke proceeds: '*Smaller men, too, have been slaves, have been as patriotic as they (i.e. Pitt, etc.), but less useful.*' I suggest, but with diffidence, *smaller men, though they have been slaves*.

- II 191 *The other Duke shook his head, thereby declaring in his opinion that Phineas Finn was in truth the man who had murdered Mr. Bonteen. Delete the first in.*

- II 204 '*My darling lost one always thought that there should be two present to hear such matters. He said it was safe.*' Read *safer*.

- II 206 perhaps *had not therefore* <long> *enjoyed*.

- II 208 *did* <not> *like being questioned*.

- II 211 '*Caveat emptor is the only motto going, and the worst proverb that ever came from dishonest stony-hearted Rome. With such a matter as that to guide us no man dare trust his brother.*' For *matter* read *motto*.

- II 214, line 5 from foot, perhaps *meet there*, i.e. in Newgate. So 373, line 7 from foot, *there* would be more pointed than *then*. Cf. *Ayala's Angel*, 19 (line 14 from foot), 36 (last line), 37 (line 2).

- II 255 The Attorney-General replied for the prosecution; *he must submit to them (the jury) that his learned friend had not shown that acquaintance with human nature which the gentleman undoubtedly possessed in arguing that there had lacked time for the conception . . . of the crime*. A good point; Mr. Chaffanbrass had, in fact, consummately concealed his own knowledge in order to humbug the jury. But a cleverer man than Sir Gregory might have said not *the gentle-*

- man but *those* (or *the*) gentlemen; for juries like to be told that they are wiser than counsel.
- II 257, last line, *required* is unobjectionable, but *acquired* would perhaps be more natural.
- II 265 Lady Laura *could not go up in the Court* (the Old Bailey) *and speak for him* (Phineas). Perhaps *get up in*, or *go up into*.
- II 278 *Madame Goesler . . . had ventured to avert her face without making the motion apparent to her friend*. For *ventured* read *contrived*. I owe this correction to Sir Edward Marsh.
- II 280 *men no bigger than Laurence Fitzgibbon were forced to subject themselves to the benevolence of the under-sheriff*. The reference is to II 223, where it was explained that 'ordinary mortals' might get a seat at Finn's trial, on the first day, if suitably introduced to the under-sheriff. The present passage deals with the last day, when the court was even more crowded; the Prime Minister and both the Dukes were present. Now Fitzgibbon was not an ordinary mortal, but an M.P. The point is that even important people now had to intrigue for seats. *no bigger* gives the wrong sense; read *bigger*, or *no lesser*?
- II 296, last line, perhaps *his* should be *her*.
- II 308, l. 14 from foot, for *were* read *was*.
- II 311 '*the quarrel of lovers is the renewal of love*'. It is *quarrels* at 321, and Trollope of course knew *amantium irae amoris integratio*, which is a chapter-title in *Framley Parsonage*.
- II 315 '*If you get a young man down into a country house, and there has been anything at all between them, I don't see how he is to escape*.' Perhaps a young man <and a young woman>.
- II 318 *Standish* should be *Kennedy*. Lady Laura did not resume her maiden name when Kennedy died; she signs herself (330) *Laura Kennedy*. This is no doubt Trollope's slip, not a printer's misreading.
- II 319 *Muttering some words, half of apology and half of self-assertion, she did leave the room*. It was Madame Goesler's rejected suitor, the elderly 'padded dandy', who left the room with his tail between his legs. For *she* read *he*.
- II 327 Lady Laura *sat opposite the mirror, and pored over her own features with an almost skilful scrutiny, and told herself at last aloud that she had become an old woman*. Either *almost*, or *skilful*, or both are wrong? Perhaps *almost* conceals *anxious*.
- II 350, line 6, *Mr. Bonteen* should be *Mrs. Bonteen*.
- II 366 '*I am* (not) *fond of bitterness myself, but I do regret the roughness of the House of Commons*.' Planty Pall is regretting his succession to the peerage. But he was of all men the least *fond of bitterness*.
- II 368 *the rumour of her husband's jealousy and of the wife's love is just possible; but no doubt Trollope wrote the husband's*.
- II 415 perhaps '*any* (more) *wine*'. Phineas had not refused to fill his glass, see 413.

AINSWORTH AND THOMAS HARDY

BY CARL J. WEBER

After his wife's death in Florence in 1861 Robert Browning returned to England. As time went on and his grief over his loss was softened, he gradually resumed the social habits of his earlier years in London. He found, however, that the city of the widowed Queen Victoria was a different place from the city he had eloped from twenty years earlier. From time to time he met reminders of those former days. He reported an incident of this sort to a friend at a dinner-party in the late eighteen-sixties.

'A sad, forlorn-looking being stopped me today', said Browning, 'and reminded me of old times. He presently resolved himself into—whom do you think?'

The friend couldn't think.

'Harrison Ainsworth!' said Browning.

'Good heavens!' the friend exclaimed in astonishment, 'Is he still alive?'

William Harrison Ainsworth belonged in fact to an earlier generation of writers. Born on February 4, 1805, he began to write before the death of Scott, and he published his first book before *Pickwick Papers* appeared. Ainsworth's first book was an immediate success. Six editions were called for in three years, and the story was translated into French and German. It was not long before his novels (he eventually wrote forty of them) were selling better than those of Dickens. Who reads him today?

Ainsworth began his career with the idea of reviving for a nineteenth century public the terrors which had thrilled the readers of Mrs. Radcliffe. His father had aroused a boyish interest in highwaymen by romantic accounts of the exploits of Dick Turpin, who had been executed in 1750, and Ainsworth decided to introduce this notorious character into his story. One of its most remarkable episodes is the highwayman's ride to York. Ainsworth afterwards declared that this account was written in twenty-four hours of continuous work.

'I began in the morning,' he recalled, 'wrote all day, and, as the night wore on, my subject had completely mastered me, and I had no power to leave Turpin on the highroad. I was swept away by the curious excitement and novelty of the situation; and being personally a good horseman, passionately fond of horses, and possessed, moreover, of accurate knowledge of a great part of the country, I was thoroughly at home with my work, and galloped on with my pet highwayman merrily enough.'

Turpin made the fortune of the book. *Rookwood* took the public by storm. The first edition in three volumes was published in 1834, and in 1836 an edition with illustrations by George Cruikshank appeared. Like Byron, Ainsworth awoke one morning and found himself famous. He followed up his success with a long series which delighted the readers of a hundred years ago. *The Tower of London* (1840) was followed by *Old St. Paul's* (1841: who will notice its centenary in 1941?), *The Miser's Daughter* (1842), *Windsor Castle* (1843), *St. James's* (1844), and nearly two-score others. Many of these appeared first in the columns of *Ainsworth's Magazine*, which lasted from 1842 to 1854. In 1880 there appeared a Uniform Edition of his works. He died on January 3, 1882.

Although Ainsworth's collected works fill a long library shelf, he has not enriched English literature with a single figure. His giants and dwarfs, his mysterious goblin riders, his kings and queens, his heroes and villains, his misers and his highwaymen, have all faded into 'the dark backward and abysm of time'. There would be none except an antiquarian reason for looking into his books today, if it were not for the fact that Ainsworth exerted a profound influence upon another writer whose centenary last year was widely observed. Thomas Hardy, born in 1840, grew up in the society that was giving an enthusiastic welcome to Ainsworth's novels. *Old St. Paul's* became Hardy's favourite romance. It was one of the first books he ever read, 'and the thoughts of youth are long, long thoughts.' Many years later Hardy told S. M. Ellis how *Old St. Paul's* led him, at the precocious age of nine, to map out an Ainsworth Tour of London. Later Hardy read and liked Ainsworth's *Windsor Castle*. This resulted in his falling temporarily in love with a girl whose chief attraction was that she came from Windsor. At the age of 73 he remembered the pleasure he had found in this story, and in acknowledging the gift of an illustrated copy he remarked: 'I am carried back to the days of my boyhood.' And everybody now knows how

the hero of Ainsworth's *Rookwood*, Dick Turpin, reappears in a sensational chapter of Hardy's *Far from the Madding Crowd*.

What everyone does not know, however, is the extent to which William Harrison Ainsworth continued to exert a powerful influence upon Thomas Hardy—an influence that may be detected on some of his most glorious pages. Long ago Henry James observed: 'Hardy describes nature with a great deal of felicity, and is evidently very much at home among rural phenomena.' One of the nature passages that has commanded universal admiration is the account of the storm in *Far from the Madding Crowd*. Of it Lionel Johnson remarked: 'The passage fills me with a strange fear; so magical seems this warning of nature in the night; and with a strange shame; so little should I have understood it. The richness of the world in wonder is opened before us.' John Drinkwater adds: 'This is the note which Mr. Hardy has brought into the English novel, and by which he may hereafter be judged the greatest of English novelists.'

Where did Thomas Hardy learn to observe the phenomena of nature? Or, to put the question more exactly: having learned to observe, where and how did he learn to put into effective English the results of his observation? I am not aware that any previous attempt has been made to set Hardy's famous chapter on 'The Storm' side by side with Ainsworth's similar chapter in *Rookwood*. But a comparison of the two will, I think, leave no doubt about their relationship. The descriptions are too long to copy out *in extenso*, but I here set side by side the pertinent sentences from the two books:

From *Rookwood*
(1834)

Book II, Chapter I: 'The Storm'

The night was wild and stormy. The day had been sultry, with a lurid, metallic-looking sky . . . As evening drew on, everything betokened the coming tempest. Unerring indications of its approach were noted by the weatherwise . . . The kine . . . wended stallwards, undriven . . . The deer . . . bounded off to their coverts . . . The rooks . . . cawed in a way that . . . bespoke their apprehension; and were seen . . . croaking to their mates . . . from the highest branches of the lime-trees . . . At sunset, the hazy vapour . . . rose up in spiral volumes, like smoke from a burning forest, and, becoming gradually

From *Far from the Madding Crowd*
(1874)

Chapter 37: 'The Storm'

The weather was . . . dry and sultry . . . The night had a sinister aspect . . . The moon . . . had a lurid metallic look. Every voice in nature was unanimous in bespeaking change . . . It was Nature's . . . way of hinting . . . to prepare for foul weather. The sheep . . . trailed homeward head to tail . . . A herd of heifers . . . were . . . galloping about in the wildest and maddest confusion . . . The behaviour of the rooks had been confused . . . The sheep . . . had now a terror of something greater than their terror of man . . . A heated breeze . . . slowly fanned the summits of lofty objects . . . A hot

condensed, assumed the form of huge, billowy masses, which, reflecting the sun's light, changed . . . to ashy, angry grey. Night rushed onwards. . . . There was a dead calm. The stillness was undisturbed, save by an intermittent, sighing wind, which, hollow as a murmur from the grave, died as it rose. At once the grey clouds turned to an inky blackness. A single, sharp, intensely vivid flash shot from the bosom of the rack, sheer downwards, and struck the earth with a report like that of a piece of ordnance. In ten minutes it was dunest night, and a rattling thunderstorm. The progress of the storm was watched with infinite apprehension . . . in the great hall; and loud and frequent were the ejaculations uttered, as each succeeding peal burst over their heads . . . All was pitch dark without; the lightning was now only seen at long intervals, but the rain still audibly descended in torrents.

breeze, as if breathed from the parted lips of some dragon . . . , fanned him . . . while . . . in the north rose a grim misshapen body of cloud . . . The faint cloudlets had flown back into the south-east corner of the sky, as if in terror of the large cloud. . . . The night had a haggard look, like a sick thing, and there came finally an utter expiration of air from the whole heaven . . . which might have been likened to a death. And now nothing was heard . . . All was silent . . . Then there came a . . . flash . . . The lightning was the colour of silver, and gleamed in the heavens. A moment later and there was a smack—smart, clear, and short. Not a drop of rain had fallen as yet . . . Out leapt the fifth flash . . . Then came the peal. It hardly was credible that such a heavenly light could be the parent of such a diabolical sound. "How terrible!" she exclaimed . . . It was a stupefying blast . . . A grating noise . . . the vane on the roof turning round . . . was the signal for a disastrous rain . . . The . . . shimmer of the dying lightning showed a marble face high against the black sky . . . The rain came on in earnest . . . The rain stretched obliquely through the dull atmosphere in liquid spines.

In both passages the sequence of events is the same: the sultry weather, the confused activity of the animals, the calm, the vivid flash of lightning, the crash of thunder, the black sky, the torrent of rain. All this Hardy might have learned directly from nature herself; but only Ainsworth supplied him with the long list of identical words: sultry, lurid, metallic look, night, rooks, lightning, flash, peal—a list that would have been multiplied but for the skilful way in which Hardy paraphrased Ainsworth, turning 'kine' into 'sheep,' 'deer' into 'heifers,' 'the grave' into 'a death,' 'hazy vapour' into 'hot breeze,' 'sighing wind' into 'expiration of air from heaven,' 'highest branches' into 'summits of lofty objects,' 'pitch dark' into 'black sky,' etc. Careful study of the two chapters will make it clear that Hardy might, in speaking of Ainsworth, have admitted that 'he gave me eyes, he gave me ears.' Thomas Hardy soon outdistanced his teacher, but it was Ainsworth who taught him how to describe a storm.¹

¹ I have previously called attention to similar parallelisms in other Wessex novels. See 'A Connecticut Yankee in King Alfred's Country', *The Colophon* (New Series 1:525-535), June 1936; and 'Plagiarism and Thomas Hardy', *The Colophon* (New Series 2:443-454), July 1937.

The older novelist had other lessons to teach. In *The Miser's Daughter* Ainsworth wrote: 'He had some choice pictures of the Flemish school, . . . undoubted originals by Lely and Kneller.' In *A Pair of Blue Eyes* Hardy referred to the 'cadaverous complexion fixed by Kneller and Lely,' and in 'Squire Petrick's Lady' (*A Group of Noble Dames*, VI) he makes another Flemish reference, to 'the painters Vandyke and Lely'. Hardy learned this lesson only too well. Allusions to painters, often to extremely obscure artists, became a fixed habit with him. True, he was genuinely interested in the arts and might have learned, naturally and independently, to refer to painters. But even before Hardy had seen continental art galleries, Ainsworth had taught him how to give a 'learned' flavour to a page by a reference to Kneller. In the fragment which has survived from his 'lost' novel, he mentions Correggio, Angelico, Murillo, Rubens, Turner, Romney, Bonozzi, Raphael, and Gozzoli; and similar lists can be culled from the pages of other Hardy novels.

Ainsworth's characters are forgotten, but their names often linger on in Hardy's novels and poems. Amabel, the grocer's daughter who is the beautiful heroine of *Old St. Paul's*, is recalled in Hardy's poem 'Amabel,' composed when he was twenty-five. Abel in Ainsworth's *Miser's Daughter* suggests Hardy's Abel in *The Mayor of Casterbridge*. In Ainsworth's *The Star Chamber* (1854) appear Giles and Jocelyn. Their names call to mind Giles in *The Woodlanders* and Jocelyn in *The Well-Beloved* as well as Jocelyn St. Cleave, Swithin's uncle in Hardy's *Two on a Tower*. Brideoak in Ainsworth's *Mervyn Clitheroe* (1858) is recalled by the name 'Bridehead' in *Jude the Obscure*, and 'Oak' in *Far from the Madding Crowd*. All this may be merely coincidence, but the memory of Hardy's statement that Ainsworth was his favourite boyhood author justifies our thinking that these echoes are significant.

Unskilful though Ainsworth was in character portrayal, he sometimes dropped suggestions that sank like good seed into Hardy's fertile soil. In *Windsor Castle* (which Hardy never forgot) Ainsworth remarked: 'Few women are proof against ambition. Vanity—vanity is the rock they split upon.' In *Far from the Madding Crowd* Hardy wrote: 'That's a handsome maid, but she has her faults. And the greatest of them is—well, what it is always . . . Vanity.' The verbal parallel here is too slight to carry, unaided, any weight; but in the light of other reminders of Ainsworth found in the same

novel, the two passages seem worth a passing glance. Hardy's social experience was then (or even later) far too limited to make it safe for him to generalize dogmatically about women. The hint about the sex, picked up in early years from Ainsworth, may easily have flowered into that fixed attitude toward women that led one of them to scrawl 'Oh, how I hate Thomas Hardy!' in a copy of *The Return of the Native* once seen by Sir James Barrie.

The dialogue of Ainsworth's novels is stilted and artificial, and it is easy to understand why, with such a model, Hardy was slow in learning to make his characters talk naturally. Fenwolf in *Windsor Castle* 'signified his grateful acquiescence' instead of saying 'Yes, thank you'; and Hardy's eighteen-year old Cytherea (in *Desperate Remedies*), when she wants to say, 'Don't be upset!', remarks earnestly: 'If you should fail, don't be perturbed. The truly great stand upon no middle ledge.'

Ainsworth's descriptions are filled with trite superfluities. Take this sample from *Windsor Castle*: 'Nothing was wanting to enhance the beauty of the spectacle. On the left the silver Thames, crowded with craft, filled with richly dressed personages of both sexes, amid which floated the pompous barge appropriated to the officers of the Garter.' No wonder Hardy, brought up on (or 'amid') an 'enhanced' diet under which men and women became 'personages of both sexes,' wrote (in *Far from the Madding Crowd*) of 'a fair product of nature in a feminine direction,' and stated that 'man is a cryptographic page.' No wonder that the reader of Hardy comes upon 'flexuous domesticity,' and hears about 'an untenable redemptive theolatri,' and reads that a 'half-conscious rhapsody was a pantheistic utterance in a monotheistic falsetto.'

Other points of relationship between the two authors must be mentioned more briefly. Ainsworth had a keen interest in folk-lore and liked the superstitious stories of popular tradition. Hardy acquired this interest too, and made effective use of it in his short stories as well as in his novels. One of the contributors to *Ainsworth's Magazine* was G. P. R. James, and James became one of Hardy's youthful enthusiasms. In 1872 a dramatization of Ainsworth's *The Miser's Daughter* was produced at the Adelphi Theatre in London. Nine years later Hardy attempted a dramatization of his own Dick-Turpin-and-the-Storm novel, *Far from the Madding Crowd*. In *Windsor Castle* Ainsworth had called Christ Church at Oxford Cardinal College.' When Hardy came to write his own account of

Oxford, Christ Church again appeared as 'Cardinal College.' Ainsworth had deliberately scattered the historical periods covered by his novels, so that they did not overlap and one led directly on to another. Thus *Windsor Castle* deals with the time of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn; *The Tower of London* picks up the thread of history six years after the death of Henry VIII and traces the career of Lady Jane Grey, from her proclamation as Queen on July 10, 1553, to her execution on February 12, 1554. *Old St. Paul's* deals with the exciting days from the Great Plague of April 1665 to the Great Fire of September 1666. As already mentioned, Dick Turpin, in *Rookwood*, was executed in 1750. Thomas Hardy made use of this same plan of historical dispersal and was equally careful and methodical in timing the action of his novels. From the Napoleonic era of *The Trumpet-Major* and the eighteen-forties of *The Return of the Native*, Hardy went on to deal with every decade of the nineteenth century.¹

In 1910 Lewis Melville asked a bookseller if there was any demand for Ainsworth's books.

'Oh, yes,' replied the bookseller; 'certain of his works are eagerly sought.'

Melville expressed surprise at this information, but the bookseller went on to explain:

'Surely you know that there is always a steady demand for all books illustrated by Cruikshank.'

The bookseller's remark recalls a discerning judgment by Thackeray. Writing in the *Westminster Review* for June, 1840, Thackeray showed his immediate grasp of what it has taken others a hundred years to learn. He wrote:

With regard to the modern romance of *Jack Sheppard*, it seems to us that Mr. Cruikshank really created the tale, and that Mr. Ainsworth, as it were, only put words to it. Let any reader of the novel think over it for awhile, now that it is some months since he has perused and laid it down—let him think, and tell us what he remembers of the tale? George Cruikshank's pictures—always George Cruikshank's pictures. The storm in the Thames, for instance: all the author's laboured description of that event has passed clean away—we have only before the mind's eye the fine plates of Cruikshank.

Cruikshank's illustrations alone are enough to preserve these best-

¹ See my articles on 'Chronology in Hardy's Novels', *Publications of the Modern Language Association* (53: 314-320; 54: 620), March 1938 and June 1939.

sellers of a century ago. But if no one now reads Ainsworth for his own sake, he at least deserves a quiet shelf in a Thomas Hardy library; for as one surveys the Wessex Novels it is clear that the shadow of William Harrison Ainsworth falls across many of their pages.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

THE CANCELS IN JOHNSON'S *JOURNEY*, 1775

The cancels in Johnson's writings afford striking evidence of the sobering effect of reflection, after he had found time to reconsider his outbursts. He never took kindly to the sombre task of revision; and whenever he decided to request an alteration in a passage already printed off, it was likely to be because a sentence seemed needlessly harsh or essentially unjust. Most of the cancels in his edition of Shakespeare were certainly prepared to soften his judgments on Warburton's work, and another example, in *Falkland's Islands*, is the cancel (leaf K2) prepared at the request of the ministry to soften the attack on George Grenville, of whom Johnson had written: 'Let him not, however, be depreciated in his grave; he had powers not universally possessed; if he could have got the money, he could have counted it.' Johnson's last-minute substitution, 'If he sometimes erred, he was likewise sometimes right,' weak though it is, can perhaps be accepted in the belief that it allowed Lord North to sleep better.

Of the two cancels (D8 and U4) in the *Journey to the Western Islands*, the first is an analogous case, which, though familiar to most people, is worth retelling. Johnson recalls that the lead which covered the two cathedrals of Elgin and Aberdeen was ordered to be sold to help support the army, and adds, perhaps for Boswell's benefit, 'A Scotch army was in those times very cheaply kept.' But the order, he continues, 'was obeyed; the two churches were stripped, and the lead was shipped to be sold in Holland. I hope every reader will rejoice that this cargo of sacrilege was lost at sea.' Up to this point the indictment is suitably general, but Johnson then adds an attack on the dean and chapter of his own cathedral at Lichfield: 'Let us not however make too much haste to despise our neighbours. There is now, as I have heard, a body of men, not less decent or virtuous than the Scottish council, longing to melt the lead of an English cathedral. What they shall melt, it were just that they should swallow.'

But four days after he had corrected the last page of the book, he wrote to his printer, William Strahan, to ask about cancelling this paragraph. 'In one of the pages there is a severe censure of the Clergy of an English Cathedral which I am afraid is just, but I have since recollected that from me it may be thought improper, for the Dean did me a kindness about forty years ago. He is now very old, and I am not young. Reproach can do him no good, and in myself I know not whether it is zeal or wantonness. Can a leaf be cancelled without too much trouble? . . . Tell me your mind; if you will cancel it, I will write something to fill up the vacuum.' What he wrote 'to fill up the vacuum' is the pleasantly innocuous text that we know:

Our own cathedrals are mouldering by unregarded dilapidation. It seems to be part of the despicable philosophy of the time to despise monuments of sacred magnificence, and we are in danger of doing that deliberately, which the Scots did not do but in the unsettled state of an imperfect constitution.

So far as I know, the only copy of the cancelled leaf now available is in the Adam Collection at Rochester, New York. But Messrs. Tregaskis owned a copy (probably not the same one) in 1920, and in Dr. Lort's sale, in April 1791, lot 2156 was a copy of the *Journey* in which were preserved the cancelled passages relative to Lichfield Cathedral and respecting 'the Cave of Egg and the transaction at that place'. Archdeacon Wrangham refers to this copy,¹ and Dr. Chapman mentions it in his edition of the *Journey*; but I do not find that anyone has seen the book since 1791. Dr. Chapman, I think properly, chose to disregard Archdeacon Wrangham's hint of the reason for the cancelled U₄ and to accept the normal probability of an indiscreet outburst: 'Perhaps Johnson had written indiscreetly of Popery or of Calvinism.'

In this example, however, normal probability is misleading. I have not recovered a copy of the original U₄, but a fortunate offset in the copy of the *Journey* now at Yale makes it possible to recover Johnson's unheroic reason for cancellation. At the bottom of p. 295 Johnson writes:

The only Popish Islands are *Egg* and *Canna*. *Egg* is the principal Island of a parish, in which, though he has no congregation, the Protestant Minister resides. I have heard of nothing curious in it, but the cave in which a former generation of the Islanders were smothered by *MacLeod*.

¹ See Courtney's *Bibliography of Johnson*, p. 123.

The next paragraph of the revised text, whence Dr. Chapman derived his hypothesis, is worth quoting:

If we had travelled with more leisure, it had not been fit to have neglected the Popish Islands. Popery is favourable to ceremony; and among ignorant nations, ceremony is the only preservative of tradition. Since protestantism was extended to the savage parts of Scotland, it has perhaps been one of the chief labours of the Ministers to abolish stated observances, because they continued the remembrance of the former religion. We therefore who came to hear old traditions, and see antiquated manners, should probably have found them amongst the Papists.

The break comes, it is clear, after the smothering of the islanders, an episode of which even the least adventurous among us would expect to hear more after its pointed introduction into the narrative. That Johnson did write in more detail I can reconstruct from the offset. The top of p. 296 in its original state began as follows: 'The inhabitants once laid hold on [a boat] manned by *Macleods*, and tying the [crew] hand and foot, pushed them off into the ocean. [Which] way they escaped is not told [anywhere]. . . . informed how his vassals . . . demanded the offenders . . . to deliver. . . .' The text grows indecipherable, and only scattered words are legible on the rest of the page. Nevertheless, although we can recover the complete flavour of Johnson's prose only if someone can discover a copy of the cancelled leaf (or a more complete offset), we can be certain that Johnson told in some detail of the punishment that *Macleod* inflicted on the inhabitants of the island of Egg; his observations on Catholicism are an afterthought.

His reason for the cancellation will be readily apparent from the following passage on p. 154:

The inhabitants of the Isle of *Egg*, meeting a boat manned by *Macleods*, tied the crew hand and foot, and set them a-drift. *Macleod* landed upon *Egg*, and demanded the offenders; but the inhabitants refusing to surrender them, retreated to a cavern, into which they thought their enemies unlikely to follow them. *Macleod* choked them with smoke, and left them lying dead by families as they stood.

The cancel, in other words, was necessary not because Johnson had written, as in other cases, indiscreetly; but because he had written, as any one may, forgetfully. In collecting his materials, a year after his trip, he had told the same story twice: one passage required excision, and the remarks on the interrelations of Popery, ceremony, and tradition were prepared by Johnson to 'fill up the vacuum'.

A. T. HAZEN.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of the *Review of English Studies*.

Sir,

POPE'S 'LOST' POEMS

There are numerous poems attributed to Pope by his contemporaries or even acknowledged by the poet himself, about which little or nothing is known, and which have never been 'collected' hitherto. The majority of them I have been fortunate enough to identify, locate and examine; but as many as thirteen in print or manuscript still evade my search.

In order, therefore, to make as complete as possible my forthcoming volume of Pope's miscellaneous poems (*Twickenham Edition*, Vol. VI), may I be allowed the courtesy of your columns to appeal to your readers for information about any of this elusive baker's dozen?

I should be grateful for (and should of course, duly acknowledge) any help towards the discovery or identification of copies, in manuscript or print, of the poems mentioned in the subjoined list—concerning which I should perhaps first explain that each reference is for the most part given in the words of the original (and only known) allusion to the poem, and consequently does not necessarily represent the wording of the actual title; and that any printed version will probably be anonymous, or pseudonymous.

1. 'A few Verses which he wrote upon a merry Mistake made by a Physician, at the House of a noble and most estimable Earl.'
2. 'Horace's description of the Fortunate Islands' (Epode XVI, 41-63). 'Dean Berkley . . . got Mr. Pope to translate it into English, and I have seen the translation.—Mr. R. A.'
3. 'A poetical Epistle sent to [Thomson the poet when in] Italy.' [Some lines of which were 'transplanted' into the *Epistle to Arbuthnot*.]
4. 'Verses by Mr. Pope under two Pictures:
(i.) Representing a Gentleman Combing a Lady's Hair.
5. (ii.) Some Ladies at Prayers by the Bed-side of a Sick Person.

6. A poem 'by Mr. Pope, on Mr. Cowper's birth-day.'
7. 'Pope's Fables' [Offered at a sale of books in 1721].
8. 'A Translation of Cicero de Senectute.' 'I translated Tully's *de Senectute* in this early period, and there is a copy of it in Lord Oxford's library.'
9. Portion of an epic poem, *Brutus*: 'part of the manuscript in *blank verse*, now lies before me' [O. Ruffhead, 1769].
10. *Fourth Satire of the Second Book of Horace*. Imitated.
11. *First Satire of the First Book of Horace*. Translated.
12. 'An anonymous Ode written by Pope for Cibber, [with] this conclusion:

So shall the Crown and Laurel too
Descend from fool to fool.'

13. 'An Imitation of Horace' [probably anon.; published about March-April 1716; incorporates an attack on Dennis, though his name may not appear.]

One other request: I should also much appreciate the loan for a few weeks from any of your readers of a copy of *The Works of Alexander Pope, Esq; Vol. II. Part I. Containing his Epistles, &c.* London: Printed for R. Dodsley . . . MDCCXLIII. (Griffith, no. 583), as the Bodleian does not possess this book.

255 Cowley Road.
Oxford.

NORMAN AULT.

REVIEWS

Fifteen Poets (CHAUCER, SPENSER, SHAKESPEARE, MILTON, DRYDEN, POPE, COWPER, COLERIDGE, WORDSWORTH, SHELLEY, BYRON, KEATS, BROWNING, TENNYSON, ARNOLD). Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1941. Pp. xiv+503. 6s. net.

The purpose of this selection, with short introductory essays and biographical summaries, from the poetry of Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden, Pope, Cowper, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Shelley, Byron, Keats, Browning, Tennyson, and Arnold, is, as the Preface informs us, to supply a link 'between the normal type of anthology, in which a large number of poets are each represented by a small amount of verse, and the "Complete Works" of the poets.' It is presumably intended as a class-book for upper forms in schools and for Intermediate and Pass classes at universities, where it should prove most useful and supply a real need. Nevertheless, it may, perhaps, be questioned whether the consequent increase in price would not have been more than counterbalanced by increased usefulness if another two hundred pages had been added. As it is, each poet is allotted, on the average, some twenty-five pages of verse, which means that Shakespeare (to include extracts from whose plays the number of sonnets included has been reduced to five), Milton, Coleridge, Keats, Shelley, and Arnold occupy little, if any, more space than they do in the *Oxford Book of English Verse*, while Wordsworth and Tennyson occupy even less. For these poets, therefore, except for the useful introductions, this selection hardly supersedes, as a class-book, the *Oxford Book of English Verse*.

In attempting to introduce Chaucer in less than seven pages, Mr. Bennett has discharged a difficult task almost as well as could be expected. His selection, however, is strangely inadequate, and made upon a principle difficult to detect: an extract from the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales* which omits the description of the Pilgrims; the introduction to *The Man of Law's Tale*, chiefly interesting for its list of Chaucer's works; the Prologue to the same tale; *The Pardoner's Tale*; an extract from the *Nun's Priest's Tale*, beginning with the

abduction of Chanticleer; an extract from the Wife of Bath's Prologue, beginning with her fifth husband, and omitting all the glorious stuff about her life as in her time; a brief extract (at this point) from *The Book of the Duchess*, the Proem to the *Parlement of Foules*, the Envoy to *Troilus and Criseyde* (of which, surely, the two stanzas beginning 'O yonge fresshe folkes' would have sufficed), and 'Hyd, Absalom, thy gilte tresses clere.' Might one not, without exposing oneself to the charge of captiousness, suggest as a better selection: the whole of the Prologue to the *Tales*; the Death of Arcite, prefaced by a short analysis of the *Knight's Tale*; the whole of the Wife of Bath's Prologue; an extract (the famous extract) from the Prologue to *The Legend of Good Women*?

Mr. Lewis has tried to decide whom he is writing for, and has decided that it is for the mature reader who has *not* become acquainted with the *Faerie Queene* in a large, and, preferably, illustrated edition, on a wet day, between the ages of twelve and sixteen. The imaginary illustrations—Venetian paintings and homely woodcuts—neatly lead up to a brief disquisition on that antithesis between Italianate Spenser and English Spenser which he has elaborated elsewhere. The selection is not nearly so good as the admirable introduction. The January *Eclogue*—to support the introductorily expressed opinion that the *Shepherd's Calendar* is 'nearly worthless'? The *Epithalamion*—yes. The Lament for Daphnaida—perhaps, but would not some extracts from *The Ruines of Time* have been better? The fight between the Red Cross Knight and Sansjoy—why? Because there had to be at least one fight, and this was no worse than the rest? The Cave of Mammon—yes. The Bower of Bliss—too short. Britomart in the House of Busirane—too scrappy. Might one suggest, at least as an alternative selection from the *Faerie Queene*: the Red Cross Knight and Despair (from 'Ere long they come where that same wicked wight' to the end); the whole description of the Bower of Bliss; Calidore's vision of the Graces dancing to Colin's pipe?

Professor Alexander's essay is in the main a defence of Shakespeare's style against the objections of Johnson, Arnold, and others to its uncertainty. His selection, entirely free from caprice, could hardly have been better done, although it is a pity that it was not possible to include more than five Sonnets. Mr. Tillyard, who contrives to say much in few words, insists upon the antithesis between Milton's intense vitality and extreme fastidiousness and

upon his deepening experience of life. His selection could not be improved.

Professor Dobrée, in a beautifully proportioned little essay, tells the new reader exactly what to look for in Dryden. He might, perhaps, have found space to mention the lingering metaphysical strain, apparent in the word 'chymic', which he so much admires in the line

I'm tired of waiting for this chymic gold.

Except for the two short extracts from *Annus Mirabilis*, which hardly represent that poem at its best, and for the rather crude Og and Doeg from the Second Part of *Absalom and Achitophel*, which could well have been spared for Zimri, the selection is admirable. Perhaps, though, the last half of the Prologue to *Aureng-Zebe* might have been cut to allow space for that glorious Pindaric paraphrase from Horace, beginning

Happy the man, and happy he alone

and perhaps even the extract from *All For Love* might have been sacrificed in favour of the *Secular Masque*.

Mr. Tillotson's essay, with its theme that there is nothing really revolutionary in Pope, and its reasons why Pope would not have written an *Ode to the Nightingale*, is, like his selection, wholly admirable. So, too, are Professor Sutherland's sober estimate of, and selection from, Cowper.

Mr. F. L. Lucas's essay on Wordsworth is delightful, but a little rambling. Perhaps, too, he insists too much upon Wordsworth's 'simple strength', and upon the fact that 'as a "pure poet" he is easy to criticize'. It would have been less easy but more profitable to develop the paradox that, although he wrote much dull and bad verse, Wordsworth can supply as much 'pure poetry' as almost any other poet—which is presumably what Arnold meant when he said that now and then Nature would take the pen from his hand and write with something of his own 'bare, sheer, penetrating power'. His selection is admirable.

Mr. Ridley has some very good remarks about Coleridge and the ballad,—how, in the *Ancient Mariner*, Coleridge has captured the true spirit of the ballad in describing the supernatural as though it were normal, while in *Christabel*, which Mr. Ridley finds an exasperating poem, he has kept the two realms painfully distinct. The selection made itself.

Mr. Auden (he could hardly have done otherwise) discusses, and discusses well, Byron's poetry in close relationship with Byron's life; but, strangely enough, although he speaks of 'acute consciousness of guilt and sin', he does not mention Augusta. His selection is excellent.

Mr. Blunden's essay on Shelley is, for its size, too tentative, disjointed, and eddying, but at the end of it even one familiar with Shelley will feel that his understanding of the poet has been deepened. To his question, Was Shelley too facile with his own essential colours? he gives no very clear answer, but his statement, 'What he wrote in dejection has delighted more of us than all that he invented in projection', conveys much truth in few words. His selection is good on the whole, but it seems doubtful whether *Stanzas*.—April, 1814 and the sonnet *England in 1819* should have been included in a selection from which the *Skylark*, *To Jane, with a Guitar*, *The Invitation*, *The Recollection*, and the *Lines written among the Euganean Hills* have been excluded.

Mr. Macneice has written a very neat and distinguished essay on Keats, from whom his selection is unexceptionable.

Mr. Humbert Wolfe rightly insists that Tennyson's greatness is to be found in his lyric, not in his contemplative poetry, but his description of that poetry is not very precise, and is conveyed through too many vague and rather wordy metaphors; for example, of the blank verse lyrics in *The Princess* he says:

Here the mode, borrowed from France for the Elizabethan stage
throws off all fetters and soars, dips, and rises like the water-cry of the
fiddle at the world's end.

The selection is adequate, perhaps, but, as already observed, scarcely larger than that in the *Oxford Book of English Verse*.

No very clear impression either of Browning or of Browning's poetry emerges from Professor Charlton's essay; his selection, however, is excellent.

Mr. Garrod's essay on Arnold—how could it be otherwise?—is a distinguished piece of writing, although some may feel that he ought not to have accepted without a qualification Swinburne's praise of Arnold's diction. His selection is excellent.

J. B. LEISHMAN.

Tradition and Romanticism. Studies in English Poetry from Chaucer to W. B. Yeats. By B. IFOR EVANS. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd. 1940. Pp. x+213. 6s. net.

The lectures collected in this volume are devoted to the greater English poets within the limits specified, emphasis being laid upon those writers who have modified the conception of poetry. In the face of recent attacks upon so-called 'romantic' elements in modern English poetry Professor Evans argues that the distinction between 'classic' and 'romantic' as applied to English poets misrepresents the facts. 'We have no "movements" in the sense in which France had a romantic movement and Germany a romantic school.' On the contrary, English poetry, from its beginning, shows a consistent sense of compromise between tradition and experiment, a spirit to which neither of the terms 'classic' or 'romantic' is strictly suited. Chaucer, having discovered for himself a new mode of realistic narrative Shakespearian in its effect of 'a world around the story,' still retained his early affection for romantic sentiment and the ways of chivalry. In Spenser the compromise shows itself in the contrast between aspiration and fulfilment. 'No poet in England, with the sole exception of Milton, gave more thought to the production of a poetry that was classical. Few poets have produced work whose effect and influence have been less classical.' The achievement of Shakespeare renders meaningless the opposition of the two tendencies, yet in his mingling of forms Shakespeare was only following the English tradition. Milton's dual allegiance is sufficiently evident both from the preliminary schemes and from the final form and content of his epic. Dryden's position as poet and critic is consistently one of compromise between English freedom and French correctness. The cults of Gothic and of the picturesque date back to the earlier phases of the age of reason. The greater nineteenth-century poets are more profitably studied on their individual merits than as members of a romantic school.

Within the compass of a small volume Professor Evans has covered a wide range of material, presenting it in a compact and readable form. His consideration of individual poets against the background of the English poetic tradition has entailed the citation of evidence and analogues from widely different sources; but at no point can he be accused of losing hold of his main thesis or of failing to see the wood for the trees. His estimates as a whole are judicious, appreciative, and unbiased, the chief exception being that of Browning, which is

certainly unjust and about which Professor Evans himself appears to have had some qualms. In avowedly presenting a case there is always a certain risk of special pleading, and I think Professor Evans exaggerates the importance attached by critics in general to the arbitrary distinction of 'classic' and 'romantic' as applied to English poetry. On the other hand, the two contrasted attitudes of mind revealed in eighteenth-century literature from Pope to Wordsworth cannot be overlooked or attributed merely to tradition. Young's *Conjectures*, which Professor Evans heartily dislikes, and Hurd's *Letters on Chivalry and Romance*, which he ignores, quite apart from their intrinsic merits or demerits, voice a profound sense of dissatisfaction with contemporary æsthetic and an aspiration towards a new sense of values in art. It is only fair to add, however, that even where we may disagree with his conclusions Professor Evans has provided us with abundant information and food for thought.

A few details are open to criticism. The sweeping assertion that 'the bottom of Chaucer's world has fallen out' as it stands is unacceptable. The letter supplementary to *The Faerie Queene* is referred to as the preface. The wording of a sentence on p. 8 might lead the reader to assign Fontenelle and Perrault to the wrong camp in the ancient and modern controversy. There are a number of misprints—on pages 32, 40, 105, 166, and 200, as well as on the fly-leaf, where the titles of two previous works by the same author are rather absurdly run together.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

The Judicious Marriage of Mr. Hooker and the Birth of 'The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity.' By C. J. SISSON. Cambridge, at the University Press. 1940. Pp. xvi+203. 10s. 6d. net.

There is no more baffling problem in bibliography than that of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*—the relation of the editions to one another, the late appearance of the last three books (VI and VIII 48 years, and VII 61 years after the author's death), and the degree of their authenticity. Professor Sisson has brilliantly reviewed the old evidence and brought to light much new evidence, especially from the prolonged suit in Chancery instituted against Sir Edwin Sandys in the interests of Hooker's daughters, who alleged that they suffered loss by his negligence in promoting publication. Certain new facts emerge with convincing force. Mrs. Hooker is not only cleared of being a party to any mutilation or destruction of her husband's

manuscripts, but she was not an unamiable wife, as Walton's *Life* has caused to be widely believed. Hooker's marriage, Professor Sisson concludes, 'was beyond question judicious, and we may believe that it was happy'. She was, indeed, injudicious in her second marriage, but that is another story. Her father, John Churchman, is shown to be a highly respectable and well-to-do Londoner, who became Master of the Merchant Taylors Company in 1594, very soon after the first volume of *Ecclesiastical Polity* appeared. It must have given Professor Sisson rare pleasure to discover that Churchman was the first Master to regale his guests with oysters at the Audit Dinner. Churchman did not belie his name; he actively helped with the publication of his son-in-law's book by giving him house-room while he was engaged in writing it, negotiating with printers, and after Hooker's death securing the unpublished writings and getting the best advice of the day on their preparation for the press. It was only in later years that he was in 'a necessitous condition' and became an honourable pensioner of the Company. Walton, no doubt, derived his unfavourable view of Churchman and his daughter from members of the Cranmer family, a prejudiced source. His *Life of Hooker* (1665) does not indeed belong to 'his last years', as Professor Sisson states; he lived another eighteen years and was yet to write his *Lives of Herbert and Sanderson*.

The evidence of Dr. John Spencer, President of Hooker's college and his friend and admirer, given publicly only four years after Hooker's death, about the mutilation of the last three Books, is at first sight very strong; but Professor Sisson shows from the Chancery proceedings that Spencer varied his account more than once in later years. It is regrettable that Professor Sisson, who is generous in printing relevant documents, does not print Bishop Andrewes's letter of November 6, 1600, especially as that letter is misleadingly summarized by Sir Sidney Lee in the *D.N.B.* Coleridge suspected that doubts had been thrown on the authenticity of the last three Books by the High Church party, because they disliked some of their contents. Professor Sisson argues that Coleridge's suspicion was the reverse of the truth, and that they were, in fact, largely preserved through the devotion of Andrewes. He thinks that there is no really trustworthy evidence of Hooker having finished Books VI-VIII. He gives reasons, however, for thinking that Book VI "is authentic Hooker, if not the complete Hooker" of the author's manuscript.

Professor Sisson also traverses the argument of Mr. R. A. Houk

that Hooker submitted the MS. of all eight Books to Lord Burleigh with his accompanying letter of March 13, 1592-3. He believes that it was a copy, just received from Windet the printer, of the *editio princeps*, containing the long preface and Books I-IV. He faces the difficulty (though he will not convince all readers) that this means that the book of 53 folio sheets was "set up, proofed, printed off, and perfected" in exactly six weeks, between January 29, the date of its being entered at Stationers' Hall, and March 13, 1592-3. May it be suggested that Hooker sent the Lord Treasurer a print of the preface of 44 pages, outlining the argument of all eight Books? It would perhaps be as much as a busy statesman could be expected to read for immediate use in relation to forthcoming legislation. Professor Sisson suggests that the hurried production of the book was promoted by the approaching discussion of the Bill before Parliament for dealing with nonconformists. He notes that on the very day on which Hooker wrote to Burleigh Edwin Sandys spoke on the Bill in the House of Commons, and on the next day 'the bill was handed over to Burleigh to go into Committee'. The book (undated) would belong to 1593 if it was in fact produced at any date before March 25, 1594.

Professor Sisson discusses fully Edwin Sandys's unsatisfactory dealings with Hooker's book. He had committed himself to expenses amounting to £267 already, and was not unnaturally shy of further commitments, especially as the book-sellers were not encouraging about its sale. The printer Stansby queered the pitch by a pirated edition of Books I-V in 1611. A further reason for delay in printing VI-VIII may have been theological differences between Sandys and Andrewes, who was one of the trustees of the MSS. Sandys resided for considerable periods with Churchman. Professor Sisson suggests that his father, while Bishop of London (1570-5; translated to York, 1575), resided in the same parish as Churchman. The only evidence given is from the registers of St. Augustine's by Paul's Gate, but this is not convincing. It seems hazardous to identify the Margaret Sandy who was married to Francis Evington in that church in 1575 with the bishop's daughter. According to the *D.N.B.* Margaret Sandys was born in 1566, being preceded by Samuel, Edwin, and perhaps others. Even if, as Professor Sisson suggests, the order of the bishop's children was Samuel, Margaret, Agnes, Edwin, there is hardly room for the birth of Margaret and Agnes, even if they were twins, between Samuel (1560, a year after the bishop's marriage on February 19, 1558-9) and Edwin (December 9, 1561).

Readers will find this book not only of first-rate importance for the life and works of Hooker but also a lively and entertaining piece of detective work. Every writer on Hooker must reckon with it.

F. E. HUTCHINSON.

Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy, 1587-1642. By F. T. BOWERS
Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: Humphrey Milford.
1940. Pp. x+288. \$3.00; 18s. 6d. net.

This is an honest and painstaking piece of work, and in the first two chapters presents some interesting material on the general Elizabethan attitude to Revenge, its historical roots and literary formulations. But whilst it is easy to sympathize with the author's exploration of the Revenge tradition, his criteria and categories are sadly unrelated either to contemporary Elizabethan taste or to modern critical judgment. In order to trace 'the pure type' it may be necessary to subordinate *Hamlet* to the *Ur-Hamlet*, but it is difficult to see what standards allow Tourneur's *The Revenger's Tragedy* to be compared unfavourably with Chettle's *Hoffmann* in respect of its plot (p. 132), or oblige it to be said of Middleton's *Women Beware Women*, 'His people are all either villains or fools: consequently, each revenge is bad in conception and execution' (p. 163). The educated Elizabethan or Jacobean would certainly not think in terms of the 'pure type', a kind of Bradshaw's Railway Guide of incidents and characters: in what realm of thought then does the verdict stand? Probably only in that where Rymer rebukes Shakespeare for introducing a handkerchief into tragedy.¹

Mr. Bowers is not only obsessed by his 'pure type' but he has left out altogether what was, after all, of considerable importance in defining it: the rhetorical and poetic aspects, the body of tags, 'sentences', imagery, in which it took shape. Yet in poetic drama it is these which give the type its greatest possibilities; but unfortunately the linguistic unity of Revenge tragedy is confined to those plays which have already been considered by Thorndike and Stoll, and Mr. Bowers is naturally anxious to enlarge the boundaries of his subject. He therefore divides the original corpus of plays into two sections,

¹ Thus, though Mr. Bowers traces the Elizabethan beliefs about revenge in detail, he neglects such points as the 'diabolic' association of the blackamoore, which he mentions on p. 117 à propos of Aaron in *Titus Andronicus*, yet fails to relate, on p. 241, to the fact that Crotilda, of *The Fatal Contract*, when she is disguised as a Moor, takes on a purely diabolic character which is quite dissociated from her primary rôle. These kinds of irrational beliefs are the real basis of such a convention as that of Revenge Tragedy.

and adds two further divisions, the late Jacobean 'Disapproval of Revenge' and the Caroline 'Decadence', as well as an interlude, 'The Reign of the Villain'. There is, however, one aspect which he has neglected: Revenge tragedy was the only type of Elizabethan tragedy whose formulation was sufficiently recognized to receive the compliment of parody; and the several parodies (e.g. *A Warning for Fair Women*, Prologue; *The Poetaster*, Act III; *The Return from Parnassus*, the actors' scene) might have been examined in conjunction with those plays where a conventional Revenge story is mixed up with another type of play (e.g. Dekker's *Honest Whore*, Part I; Sampson's *Vow Breaker*) to establish some idea of what the Elizabethans would take for granted about such a type.

Mr. Bowers' evident enthusiasm for his subject and the modesty with which he presents his labours make it a very reluctant duty to dwell upon the limitations which are perhaps unavoidable under the modern system of token research.

The following misprints have been noted: p. 41, note 2: for 'on *Phænissæ*' read 'in *Phænissæ*'; p. 50, note 19: for 'la publica' read 'la pública' and for 'anche' read 'ánche'¹; p. 54: for 'Inglese Italianato è un diablo incarnato' read 'diabolo', Ascham's (?) misprint for 'uno diávolo'; p. 164, l. 1: for 'Livia's' read 'Bianca's'; p. 198, note 7: for 'Mountfort' read 'D'Amville'; p. 260, l. 8: for 'sting' read 'sing'.

M. C. BRADBROOK.

Richard Crashaw: A Study in Baroque Sensibility. By AUSTIN WARREN. Louisiana State University Press, La. 1939. Pp. xvi+260. \$3.

Mr. Warren's book is both thorough and delightful. He has responded to the poetical warmth of his subject, but also to its widespread historical implication, seeking to translate 'the twentieth-century reader of Crashaw into the position of one who, three centuries ago, was informed upon the principal movements in English and Continental religion and art, and conversant with Latin, Italian, and English poetry' (p. ix). And certainly most readers of Crashaw will welcome the relevant, handy, and well-set-out information

¹ I should disagree with Mr. Bowers's translation of this passage of Italian if what he says in the text to which it is appended as footnote is intended to be a translation of it. I should read 'Private vendetta, until vengeance became a public affair, was a legal right: and even for a long time afterwards it remained a debt of honour'.

contained in the chapters *The Laudian Movement and the Counter-Reformation* and *The Emblem* as well as in those assembling the scant facts of Crashaw's biography and discussing the poetry (to the length of 120 pages).

As an interpreter of Crashaw's poetry *per se*, Mr. Warren does not take his reader much farther than Mr. Aldous Huxley took him in the few pages devoted to Crashaw in *Texts and Pretexts*. Mr. Warren shirks the most difficult things in Crashaw, some of which are also the most interesting. When quoting *Death's Lecture*, why does he give us dots instead of the lines (here set out in italic) which turn the rhetorical screw in a manner rare, if not unique, in English poetry, though in a manner familiar, for instance, in Donne's sermons :

. . . come man ;
Hyperbolized NOTHING ! know thy span ;
Take thine own measure here down, down, & bow
Before thy self in thine idæa ; throw
Huge emptynes ! contract thy self ; & shrinke
All thy Wild circle to a point. *O sink
Lower & lower yet, till thy leane size
Call heaven to look on thee with narrow eyes,
Lesser & lesser yet ; till thou begin
To show a face, fitt to confesse thy Kin,
Thy neighbourhood to NOTHING . . .*

(text of A. R. Waller's edition, 1904). And why is *The Weeper* called 'this brilliant but somewhat chill performance' (p. 232)? Why, when St. Teresa is received into heaven, does Mr. Warren speak of a 'passing homeliness' of phrase or of the 'passing grotesquerie' of the breakfast image in *The Weeper*? These elements cannot be considered as momentary. They lie deeper in Crashaw's mind than Mr. Warren realizes, and erupt more often. For instance :

Since 'tis not to be had at home
She'l travail to a Martyrdom . . .
She'l to the Moores ; And trade with them,
For this unvalued Diadem . . .
Farewell house, & farewell home !
SHE's for the Moores, & MARTYRDOM.

—this might almost be an excerpt from one of Mr. Belloc's *Cautionary Tales*. The 'homely' in Crashaw is not aberration, oversight, bathos. Like the splendid, it is part and parcel of the emotion of the poem. Crashaw's poems of religious ecstasy are not self-

consciously splendid, like *The Hound of Heaven*. Thompson would have mentioned no breakfast. Crashaw mentions breakfast because at his pitch of ecstasy there are no such categories as common or unclean. Everything is transfigured, for him at least, in the blaze of his own rapture. Breakfast suggested itself to him—his wit, the handmaid of his worship, led him to breakfast; and down it goes among the silver-footed rills and the eyes of evening. He questions the revelation no more than Moses would have questioned what was burning, had it been rosebush or broomstick.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

Andrew Marvell. By M. C. BRADBROOK and M. G. LLOYD THOMAS. Cambridge. At the University Press. 1940. Pp. viii+161. 7s. 6d. net.

'This book is intended as a critical study of Marvell', says the Preface. Such a study, in English, is due and welcome. 'The consideration of Marvell's language inevitably involves the larger questions of the social and cultural habits of the time', the Preface continues. The blurb substitutes 'Marvell's writings' for 'Marvell's language' and turns it into platitude. In actual fact there is no special stress in the book on this adjunct of literary history. This is puzzling, but so is much of the book. One's first impression is of much erudition and little judgment. Further examination corrects this in both respects. The erudition is marred by some serious inaccuracies, the judgment is 'excellent in parts'.

The most serious mis-statements are as follows:—

(1) 1644 was not the date of Marvell's return to England (p. 3), nor were 1640-4 the four years of his foreign tour (p. 155). Which these years were is unknown, but the common assumption of 1642-6 is probably not far out. In any case he met Fleckno in Rome in Lent, and our knowledge of Fleckno's movements fixes the meeting to the Lent of either 1645 or 1646.

(2) 'He now began to print his series of verse attacks upon the government policy' (p. 5). 'Now' in its context suggests the beginning of Charles II's reign, but the earliest Restoration satires ascribed to Marvell belong to 1667. There is no evidence that Marvell was responsible for printing any of them, and the series as a whole circulated in manuscript and was not printed until after the Revolution.

(3) The description of the meadow in *Upon Appleton House* does not 'involve . . . the plays of Davenant' (p. 37), but does contain a reference to Davenant's epic poem *Gondibert*.

(4) The poem on Blake's victory belongs not to 1653 (p. 53) but to 1657, and that on Cromwell's First Anniversary to the end not of 1655 (p. 53) but of 1654.

(5) 'During Marvell's lifetime the work of such men as Boyle and Linnaeus killed a great deal of old belief' (p. 57). Marvell died in 1678: Linnaeus was born in 1707.

The work contains five chapters, the first a biography and character-study, the next two dealing with the poems, and the last two with the prose-writings. These last are the least ambitious and the most satisfactory. Perhaps the plain headings 'The Rehearsal Transpros'd' and 'Minor Pamphlets and Letters' indicate this as contrasted with 'A Man of Singular Desert', 'The Critic and the Swain', 'Contemplation and Action'. At any rate, we are here given a well-balanced account of the origin and character of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* and *Mr. Smirke* together with one of the extant manuscript versions of Marvell's parody of Charles II's Speech from the Throne of 13 April 1675. This, as compared with the version printed in the 1704 *State Poems*, is accurate in the matter of names e.g. Bridock (Brideoake) as Bishop of Chichester, not Prideaux, but omits an occasional line which may or may not be genuine.

The pages devoted to a comparison of Swift's banter with Marvell's may be noted as of particular interest.

The most important part of the biographical summary is the first Appendix which deals with Marvell's 'marriage'. Cooke (1726) categorically denied it, later critics and biographers have varied in opinion. A letter by Charles E. Ward of Duke University in the *Times Literary Supplement* of 14 May, 1938 first drew attention to the Chancery suit of 1681-2 in which Mary Palmer's claim to be Mrs. Marvell was denied. Almost immediately afterwards, in the *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association of America* for June 1938, Professor F. S. Tupper published the discoveries at length. They are here neatly summarized in four pages by Miss Bradbrook and Miss Lloyd Thomas. The 'wife' was the posthumous creation of creditors. She now finally joins Mrs. Harris in Limbo.

A really satisfactory character-sketch of Marvell is almost an impossibility. Evidence is rather scanty, and the man himself retires into a 'green shade'. Where none have fully succeeded, the present

attempt is up to standard. More stress might have been laid on his enjoyment of his own company as shown, e.g.¹ by

Two Paradises 'twere in one
To live in Paradise alone.

How safe, methinks, and strong, behind
These Trees have I incamp'd my Mind.

So the World excluding round . . .

Settled in some secret Nest
In calm Leisure let me rest.

and, of course, the well-known passage in Aubrey which is here reproduced.

Aubrey says nothing about quickness of temper. This trait is probable rather than proved. The story about tripping up Parker (p. 11) is late and quite incredible. It is a mistake to describe Marvell's remarks à propos of his by-play with Sir Philip Harcourt (p. 12) as 'distinctly insubordinate'.

The Speaker cast a severe reflexion upon him yesterday when he was out of the House: and he hopes that, as the Speaker keeps us in order, he will keep himself in order for the future (*Grey's Debates*).

Marvell is at one and the same time acknowledging that his own conduct must be 'parliamentary' and insisting that the same applies to the Speaker, who, he claims, had been 'out of order' in criticising him in his absence.

But it is from the chapter on the poems that most readers will hope most. They will find two attempts of special importance, the first to establish a chronological order of groups of the poems, the second to apply modern critical methods to them.

The proposed chronological groups are as follows, so far as the poems actually discussed are concerned:—

(1) The poems on Hastings, Villiers, Lovelace and Fleckno, which can be dated, together with *The Fair Singer*, *The Match*, *Mourning*, *Daphnis and Chloe*, *The Gallery*, and *The unfortunate Lover*. These are the works of the 'critic'.

(2) *Upon Appleton House* is a transitional poem, partly the work of the 'critic' but more that of the 'swain', or rather, as 'the critic and the swain have joined forces', of both. This critic-swain is also the author of the Mower poems, of *To his Coy Mistress* and of *The Definition of Love*.

¹ See also Miss Bradbrook's own article in *R.E.S.*, January 1941.

Still belonging to this group but pointing 'forward to the fuller style of Marvell's maturity' are *The Nymph complaining for the death of her Faun*, *Young Love* and *The Picture of Little T.C.* To this period also belong *An Horatian Ode*, *Bill-borow* and *Musicks Empire*.

(3) Poems of 'Contemplation' are *The Garden*, *Bermudas*, *The Coronet*, *On a Drop of Dew*, *A Dialogue between the Soul and Body* and *A Dialogue between the Resolved Soul, and Created Pleasure*.

(4) Poems of 'Action' include the Cromwell and Fairfax poems from the second group, but the group consists chronologically of the three longish poems which celebrated the Protectorate and of the Restoration satires.

It will be seen that each group contains one or more poems which can be dated pretty definitely, and the fourth group consists entirely of such poems. In the other three the non-topical poems are grouped on account of congruity of style and outlook with the dated or datable topical poems.

This attempt at a chronology is worthy of very respectful consideration. It shows Marvell, like other 'metaphysicals', progressing from profaner poems to 'noble numbers'. It is of course open to arguments against it, which must also be weighed.

The chief difficulty, perhaps, arises from the fewness of the poems concerned. Quite a number of Marvell's poems can be regarded as single or almost single experiments in some particular manner: we have one satire in the manner of Donne (*Fleckno*), two poems on Crashaw's favourite theme (*Eyes and Tears*, *Mourning*), a poem strongly reminiscent of Donne's *Valediction (The Definition of Love)*, a few pastoral dialogues, one Horatian (but no Pindaric) Ode, a poem influenced by Browne (*The Nymph complaining*) and so on. Such experiments, however successful, form a frail support for a chronological hypothesis. Moreover, changes of mood and therefore of style may be recurrent rather than progressive. Lastly, even the above grouping by internal similarity is open to some question. Should not *The Garden* go with the central part of *Upon Appleton House*? Why should a rather thin poem like *A Dialogue between the Resolved Soul, and Created Pleasure* belong to 'the fuller style of Marvell's maturity' and *To his Coy Mistress* be excluded from it? These difficulties apply mainly to the two middle groups.

The writers lay admirable stress on the need for detailed interpretation and 'close analysis'. The search for secondary meanings, for 'ambiguities', is a more dangerous pursuit, but it has its successes.

The Nymph complaining has always been the one poem of Marvell's which I find insipid. Our authoresses (p. 47) find the Crucifixion below its surface: I am not convinced that they are wrong. If they are right, the poem takes on altogether new colour and significance.

They add new meaning, most happily, (p. 56) to

Already I begin to call
In their most learned Original

in *Upon Appleton House* by quoting a passage from Ralph Austen's *Dialogue . . . between the Husbandman and the Fruit Trees*.

On the other hand when on

My gentler Rest is on a Thought

they comment (p. 71)

'The reply itself is gentle: but *rest* includes the idea not only of *repose* but of *choice* (as in the final speech of Romeo); and also more remotely that of *support*, e.g. the iron *rest* on which the musketeer leaned his barrel. This paradoxical firmness in the idea of *gentler rest*, the underlying iron fixity, steady as the iron wedges of Fate, confirms, without making too fierce, the resolution of the Soul,'

it seems to me just nonsense. I can use the word 'rest' any day of the week in the sense either of 'repose' or of 'remainder' and be quite untroubled by the alternative meaning. Even poets in the seventeenth century used most of their words most of the time in a single, straightforward sense. The habit of searching for the *double entendre* can be dangerous, and it is still more dangerous, if one is found, to insist that it must necessarily be discovery rather than invention.

Try this:

Can a mother's tender care
Cease toward the child she bare?

'There is a pun on the child she-bear, in Latin Ursula. This suggests St. Ursula and the eleven thousand virgins—Rachel weeping for her children. How the primary meaning is deepened and enriched by the secondary suggestions!' This is no unfair parody. Indeed one can play the game of homespun associations without limit and call it a 'type of ambiguity'.

The search for remote connotations may indeed have worse consequences; it may blind the critic to the obvious. Take this on *Mourning* (p. 31):

'The cynical bystanders suggest that she is weeping for joy rather than for grief and has already acquired a new lover. Then suddenly comes a magnificent invocation of tropical seas and pearls, a richness equally

opposed to Chlora's mood of grief and to the simple cynicism of her friends:

How wide they dream! The *Indian Slaves*
That sink for Pearl through Seas profound,
Would find her Tears yet deeper Waves
And 'not of one the bottom sound.

Sailors sound to test the firmness as well as the depth of the ground; pearls are most likely to be found on an oozy bed'.

The poet says, richly enough, that her grief is not shallow. It is sad to miss this and get bogged in an oozy bed.

Again, modern psychology, valuable as it has been to criticism both constructively and destructively, is full of dangers, e.g. (p. 33)

'While the disjointed *Abess* threads
The gingling Chain-shot of her *Beads* . . .

While at my Lines the Fishes twang . . .

In these lines sensuous implication (muscular in the first case, oral in the second) is fresh and vivid'.

'Implication' beats me; few acts need less muscle than counting the beads on a rosary, and as for 'oral' I can only wonder whether it is a misprint for 'aural', and, if so, why it applies more to twanging than to gingling. Or is it 'oral' because of the fishes' mouths? 'Curiouser and curiouser'.

The kitchen shall supply the last two examples of what I hope I may be pardoned for calling Johnny-head-in-air criticism:

'So through the mortal fruit we boyl
The Sugars uncorrupting Oyl:
And that which perisht while we pull,
Is thus preserved clear and full.

Yet the sense of rounded fruits and heavy syrup is as rich as that of *St. Agnes' Eve*' (p. 34).

Well!

'My vegetable Love should grow
Vaster than Empires, and more slow.

The common misunderstanding of "vegetable Love" is a typical example of how Marvell is misread. "Vegetable" had much stronger metaphysical than culinary associations in the seventeenth century, as in the phrase "vegetable soul" or Milton's "vegetable gold" even. The nearest modern equivalent is perhaps "sentient" (p. 43).

If the young ladies reading for the English tripos immediately think of boiled cabbages, I can only protest that this is not a common

¹ Misprinted 'of not one'.

misunderstanding among intelligent readers who have ever heard of vegetating. The meaning is given in the couplet 'grow . . . slow': it is physical rather than metaphysical.

But what a grand 'ambiguity' has here been jettisoned!

This is enough to show that the book must be taken *cum grano*, but the learning and industry of its authors have nevertheless produced a work which future students of Marvell will not neglect. There is much noteworthy comment on many of the poems besides those mentioned above, especially *The Mower against Gardens* (where incidentally a highly plausible explanation of

And in the Cherry he does Nature vex,
To procreate without a Sex

is given), *Bermudas*, the other religious poems, and the political poems.

H. M. MARGOLIOUTH.

Observations upon a Late Libel, etc., 1681. Edited, with an Introduction and Bibliography, by HUGH MACDONALD. Cambridge University Press. 1940. Pp. 51. 3s. 6d. net.

After the dissolution of the Oxford Parliament on March 28th, 1681, the King's advisers thought it expedient to publish *His Majesties Declaration to all his loving Subjects touching the Causes that Moved him to dissolve the two last Parliaments*. One of the Whig replies to this Declaration was *A letter from a Person of Quality to his Friend concerning his Majesties late Declaration*, and it was as a counter-reply to this 'libel' that the *Observations*, which Mr. Macdonald has discovered, and which, in the reviewer's opinion, he is undoubtedly right in attributing to Halifax, were published.

In a brief but clear introduction Mr. Macdonald sketches the historical background and states his reasons for attributing the pamphlet to Halifax. These are (a) his discovery of a copy in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge with 'By y^e E. of Hallifax' written below the title in a contemporary hand (the reviewer understands that, since the publication of his edition, Mr. Macdonald has discovered a second copy with a contemporary ascription); (b) the characteristic use of *-eth* in the third person singular; (c) the equally characteristic use of 'right' for 'justice'; (d) various parallel passages, together with a strong general resemblance to the style and manner of Halifax in other pamphlets. Assuming, perhaps, too much intelligence and perspicacity in his readers, Mr. Macdonald has

chosen to be brief, and has not argued the case for Halifax's authorship, or anticipated possible objection, so strongly as he might have done. To his short list of parallel passages he might, perhaps, have added the following :

The Excesses of the Commons were beyond the cure of lower Remedies, and there was no other choice left, than either to part with the Parliament, or let the two Houses continue sitting in a state of Hostility hardly possible to be reconciled ; of which the consequences are so obvious, and might have been so fatal, that we are to thank God the Constitution of the Government hath lodged this necessary Power in the Crown to preserve us from Ruin upon such occasions. (p. 16.)

With this may be compared two very interesting and characteristic passages of what may be called either constitutional mysticism or mystical constitutionalism in the *Trimmer*,—two passages which, incidentally, explain much that may otherwise seem puzzling in Halifax's politics.

When all is said, there is a Natural Reason of State, an undefinable thing, grounded upon the Common Good of Mankind, which is immortal, and in all Changes and Revolutions, still preserveth its Original Right of saving a Nation, when the Letter of the Law perhaps would destroy it; and by whatsoever means it moveth, carrieth a Power with it, that admitteth of no opposition, being supported by Nature, which inspireth an immediate consent at some Critical times into every individual Member, to that which visibly tendeth to preservation of the whole. (Raleigh, p. 60.)

And a little later in the same treatise, after expressing his faith in Parliament and his belief that no such sudden external danger could fall upon the Country as to prevent the King from consulting with Parliament, he declares that, even if this strange thing should happen,

The Cases themselves will bring the Remedies along with them; and he is not afraid to allow that in order to its preservation, there is a hidden Power in Government, which would be lost if it was defined, a certain Mystery, by virtue of which a nation may at some Critical times be secur'd from Ruine; but then it must be kept as a Mystery; it is rendered useless when touch'd by unskillfull hands, and no Government ever had, or deserv'd to have that Power, which was so unwary as to anticipate their claim to it. (Raleigh, p. 65.)

Halifax the *Trimmer* conceived it his business to save a nation from ruin in critical times, and throughout all his apparent inconsistencies may be discerned a consistent attempt to maintain in home politics that Balance of Power which he also advocated in foreign affairs. When danger threatened from the Popish and Francophile policy of

the Cabal he co-operated with Shaftesbury; when the still greater danger of civil war seemed to threaten from the policy of Shaftesbury and the Whig House of Commons he transferred his support to the King; when the danger of civil war had passed while that of Popery and vassalage to France remained and increased, when he was unable either to persuade Charles to summon a new Parliament or to wean James from Catholicism, he even made overtures to Monmouth. The emphasis in *Observations upon a late Libel*, published in 1681, is therefore different from that in the *Trimmer*, published late in 1684, but there is no inconsistency between the two pamphlets, since both are based on the same fundamental principles, or, rather, principle, that of the Balance of Power.

In rescuing and editing this pamphlet Mr. Macdonald has performed a valuable service to students both of English History and of English Literature. It is to be hoped that it will be included as a matter of course in any future edition of Halifax's works.

J. B. LEISHMAN.

'The Life of Mrs. Godolphin.' By JOHN EVELYN. Edited by Harriet Sampson. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. xxxiii+282. 10s. 6d. net.

Previous editions of *The Life of Mrs. Godolphin* have derived, directly or indirectly, from the Harcourt MS., which was probably a transcript made by Evelyn, c. 1686, of the original draft which he composed at some time between November 29, 1682, and July 6, 1684. Miss Harriet Sampson has now edited from a manuscript in the possession of Dr. Rosenbach a revised and augmented text of the *Life*, prepared by Evelyn (apparently from the Harcourt MS.) for presentation to the Earl of Godolphin in 1702, or a little later. For her detailed collation of the two texts she has had to rely for the Harcourt version on the editions published by Bishop Wilberforce in 1847 and 1848, the manuscript being no longer available. The new Rosenbach version usefully eliminates many difficulties now seen to be due to Wilberforce's misreading of his original; it presents two fresh prefatory letters by Evelyn and a few additions in the body of the work, including a Pindaric ode by Evelyn's son; and certain portions of the Harcourt text have been rewritten—not, Miss Sampson suggests, in the interests of greater accuracy, but because, even after the lapse of many years, the loss of his friend moved Evelyn 'to give the material at hand a fresh expression'.

Miss Sampson has spared no pains to make her edition complete. In a graceful Introduction she sympathetically discusses the otherworldliness and devotion of the young Margaret Blagge, a paragon who constituted a living reproach to the corrupt court which she reluctantly adorned; and her platonic friendship with Evelyn is learnedly related to the cult of ideal, disinterested friendship which a few of the finer spirits of the age, such as Taylor and Boyle, continued to pursue. The bulk of Miss Sampson's voluminous editorial matter is, however, devoted to textual notes and commentary, and there are four appendices, of which the most interesting is perhaps the discussion of Evelyn's pentacle symbol. The 'Biographical Supplement' which rounds off the volume incorporates fresh details concerning the people mentioned in the *Life*. A great deal of conscientious study has gone to the preparation of these editorial contributions, which certainly obviate the necessity of any further scholarly edition of the Rosenbach text.

F. E. BUDD.

John Gay: Favourite of the Wits. By WILLIAM HENRY IRVING. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press. 1940. Pp. xii+334. \$3.50.

It is doubtful whether Gay deserves or requires elaborate biographical treatment. Neither his poetical merit nor his 'significance' are very great. A sketch of Dobsonian proportions is enough for him, and that we have already. But those of us who are glad of an opportunity to learn more about the Augustan Age will not be sorry that Mr. Irving thinks otherwise, for this fully documented (and rather too garishly coloured) biography is well stored with information which every student of the period will find it profitable to consult.

Gay's interest for us lies chiefly in the closeness of his association with two much greater men. Pope and Swift are known to have written in collaboration with him, and they are believed to have influenced the choice of themes for his original writings. The principal duty of a biographer, after he has established the course of events in Gay's life, must necessarily be to enlighten us on both of these points. On collaboration Mr. Irving has little new to say, but he has provided an adequate account of what is known already. On at least one occasion, however, he has not surveyed all the available evidence. He claims *The Toilette*—one of *Court Poems*—for Gay on the strength of Pope's statement to Spence and the inclusion of an enlarged version in Gay's *Poems*, 1720. This would be sufficiently convincing if we

did not also know of Lady Mary's categorical claim to the poem in her autograph manuscript now in the possession of Lord Harrowby, a fact which Mr. Irving does not mention. Mr. Ault's suggestion (*The Prose Works of Alexander Pope*, i. xcvi) of how the difficulty is to be solved should certainly have been referred to. On the influence of Pope and Swift on Gay Mr. Irving writes very well. The impression gained from this book is that Gay was a more independent writer than has hitherto been allowed. To quote two examples, Mr. Irving gives us some reason for supposing that the genesis of *The Shepherd's Week* was not entirely, or even primarily, owing to Pope's quarrel with Philips (pp. 82 ff), and the admirable account of the 'complex of ideas' from which *The Beggar's Opera* arose makes one agree in doubting whether 'the little hint about a Newgate pastoral that Swift had given Gay back in 1716 had stuck in his mind all these years' (p. 235).

An error on p. 283 needs correcting. Pope's Epistle to a young lady *On her leaving the Town after the Coronation* was addressed to Teresa and not to Martha Blount, and the Coronation in question was George I's, not George II's as Mr. Irving seems to imply.

JOHN BUTT.

Alexander Pope: 'The Rape of the Lock' and other Poems:

Edited by GEOFFREY TILLOTSON. London: METHUEN & Co. Ltd. 1940. Pp. xx+410. 16s. net.

It is encouraging in these disjointed days to see a work of scholarship, like the Twickenham Pope, which calls for devotion, concentration, and exactness, moving steadily on its way. Mr. John Butt's volume, the first to appear, is followed in something over a year by that of Mr. Tillotson, which will rank as Volume II of the complete set.

'Historical study', writes Mr. Tillotson, 'is obligatory for any student of Pope'. His poetry is of his time; its roots are in the social order of Queen Anne's days. To that time belong *The Rape of the Lock* and the Horatian imitations; against its background of literary and philosophic thought are placed the *Essay on Criticism* and *Essay on Man*. This much, so often urged in detraction of Pope and his contemporaries, is, if properly understood, an attribute of all enduring literature. No man can sever himself from his time; and it needs no argument to prove that living poetry can only spring from the soil on which the seed falls. If the critic's garden is on chalk sub-soil and the azalea withers away the fault is his and not with the shrub. And

if to-day our garden is less formal than that of Twickenham the same winds of heaven blow through the leaves and stir the flowers. Nevertheless it is true that Pope rarely strayed beyond the garden confines. 'Few poets', to quote Mr. Tillotson again, 'have built their poems so deliberately out of the detail of their time, place, and contemporaries as did Pope'. The word 'deliberately' should be noted.

Further, if we are to understand and value the poetry of Pope we must study not only its historical and social setting, but its wide allusiveness. He sought to express better what had already been said and thought. His verse is full of echoes. Pope himself gave a lead by drawing attention to passages running through his mind. His notes to *The Rape of the Lock*, for example, instance Ovid, Homer, Ariosto, Virgil, and Milton. Early editors continued the work of producing parallels; and Mr. Butt, general editor of the Twickenham Pope, announced that the several editors would pay special attention to the poet's allusiveness, recognizing that much of his poetry 'is made out of echoes and imitations of earlier poets, to whose ideas Pope gives better expression'. Mr. Tillotson's commentary is often, for pages on end, a chain of citation. Echoes, parallels, similarities in phrase and turn of versification are continuously referred to or quoted. He gathers up the work of previous editors, and adds to the increment of two hundred years whatever likenesses he has himself succeeded in tracing. The erudition of his annotation commands admiration. The poetry of Pope calls for such elucidation; but it may be questioned if all these parallels were worth quoting. How far do some belong to contemporary conventions in poetic expression or even ordinary speech? And there is a danger of suggesting that little of Pope can be counted his own, that his power of invention was weak, that he was at his best in refashioning the work of other men. This injustice to Pope's creative and imaginative gifts is, of course, far from Mr. Tillotson's intention.

Nevertheless we, who live in a swiftly changing world, are led to seek novelty, to accept in haste pretences to originality, and to look askance at those literary imitations which to Pope and his contemporaries seemed normal exercises of the pen. The contents of Mr. Tillotson's volume illustrate the contrast. Pope was but a boy when he turned off his modernizations of Chaucer, he was under thirty when *Eloisa to Abelard* and the *Verses to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady* appeared in print, and between them lay, so far as this volume

is concerned, the supreme achievement of *The Rape of the Lock*, and a Chaucerian imitation, *The Temple of Fame*. To these, within these years, we must add, though they are not in Mr. Tillotson's book, *An Essay on Criticism*, *Windsor Forest*, and three volumes of Homer. The translations of Chaucer are exercises prompted by Dryden's performances in the same kind, *The Temple of Fame*, save for a few fine passages one of Pope's less successful poems, is a more remote imitation of Chaucer, *The Rape of the Lock* is the culminating triumph of the mock-epic, an art in which Boileau and Tassoni were Pope's nearest predecessors, *Eloisa to Abelard* is modelled on the heroic epistle, and the *Unfortunate Lady* on the accepted pattern for an obituary elegy. This, for so young a man, was an output remarkable in quantity, but most for range and variety, for an instinctive sense of detail and proportion, for mastery of words, and for accomplishment in versification. 'Pope as a young poet', as Mr. Tillotson says, 'deliberately set out to excel in each of the forms of poetry most esteemed in his day'. But the measure of his success went beyond this. With *The Rape of the Lock*, at least, the difference was one of kind rather than of degree.

Mr. Tillotson's editorial labours call for unstinted praise. Thoroughness and exactness could hardly go further. Sometimes, possibly, the reader may feel the commentary too heavily loaded. In one instance, however, Mr. Tillotson might well have extended his note to embrace more fully the argument he developed in this review (xii. 401-412) showing good cause for regarding Lady Mary Wortley Montagu as the original of the *Unfortunate Lady*. Mr. Tillotson, unlike Mr. Butt, has no general introduction to the whole volume, preferring separate introductions to the poems, and these, together with his footnotes and appendixes, provide, in proportion to the text, a much larger commentary than appears in Mr. Butt's volume. Editorial preliminaries, including the useful 'List of Principal Poems of Pope to be found in the other Volumes' and a 'Chronological Table', showing the main events in the poet's life, are to be repeated in each volume of the series. The 'Chronological Table' of this volume is not, however, identical with that of Mr. Butt, showing omissions and additions unexplained by differing volume contents. The matter is of no great importance save that the ordinary reader might naturally expect identity. The contents table of the volume, by the way, omits the 'Note on the Illustrations', p. viii.

The textual basis of the poems and their typographical presentation

accord with the method adopted by the general editor of the series. The first edition of each poem is followed, save for the introduction of authoritative revision and obvious corrections, and these are made to conform to the typographical usage of the first editions in such detail as the employment of capitals and italic letter. The apparatus is confined to the record of variants 'that reach a certain level of interest'. The poems here printed, however, present little textual difficulty. Occasionally a doubt arises as to whether a variant should be regarded as intentional revision or a compositor's alteration. In instances calling for judgment and discrimination Mr. Tillotson is to be trusted. A departure from the textual principles otherwise followed is, for obvious reasons, adopted for the earlier version of *The Rape of the Lock*, which is printed exactly from the first and only edition, save for the correction of one obvious verbal error, and the further exception that 'two italic semicolons have been corrected to roman'. For Mr. Tillotson's 'semicolons' read 'colons', which was what he intended to write. And, on the same principle, should he not have corrected two roman interrogation marks, i. 8 and 10 of the later version of *The Rape of the Lock*, to italics (cf. p. 127)? And why does he retain the comma at the end of line iii. 132 of the same poem when the colon of the *Works*, 1717, or the semicolon of later editions has every appearance of authoritative revision? The mention of matters so small is only an indication of the scrupulous care with which the text has been edited. Not less careful and thorough is all Mr. Tillotson's work. And, further, his introductions, combining scholarship with a critical sensitiveness, will serve not only to a better understanding of Pope and his poetry, but also to a clearer comprehension of the intellectual and artistic ideals of the age to which he belonged.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

Rare Prologues and Epilogues. 1642-1700. Edited by Autrey Nell Wiley. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 1940. Pp. xlv + 358. 15s. net.

Professor Wiley has found an untilled field in English scholarship—or, more truly perhaps, an allotment—and she has cultivated it with some excellent results. The chronological limits of her investigation are, as she would no doubt admit, arbitrarily drawn: there is certainly no recognizable break in the prologue-epilogue tradition at the year 1700. This objection, however, is partly met by her frequent citing

of examples from the plays of Rowe, Cibber, Mrs. Centlivre, Mrs. Pix, and other dramatists of the early eighteenth century. In her Appendix A, too, she gives a list of all 'Prologues and Epilogues in Separate Publication' from 1642-1872. In Appendix D, on the other hand, which lists miscellanies containing prologues and epilogues, she stops at the year 1699. To extend this list to the eighteenth century would no doubt have swollen her bibliography very considerably, but she would at least have been able to indicate what is nowhere mentioned in this book, that nearly a dozen collections of prologues and epilogues were published during that century. One of these, *A Collection and Selection of English Prologues and Epilogues* (1779) ran to four volumes.

Professor Wiley further limits her field by printing only such pieces—there are about eighty of them—which survive in separate publication. These (which are usually folio half-sheets) she assumes, without offering any proof, to have been the 'first editions'. It should be said at once that the bibliographical side of this book is the least satisfactory part of it. Professor Wiley has collated her texts with those of the first quarto of each play for which the prologues and epilogues were written; but she lists usually only the most important differences, and the results of her collation are not set out below the text, but given (along with miscellaneous critical matter) in the introductory notes. Nor does she appear to have considered very closely the evidence which she presents. The original epilogue to *Venice Preserv'd*, for instance, is found in two different folio half-sheets, one 'Printed for A. Green. 1681' (i.e. 1681-2), the other 'Printed for A. Banks. 1682' (i.e. 1681-2?). The two texts show a surprising number of minor differences, and the text of the 1682 quarto seems to follow (if it *did* follow) now one, now the other; e.g.

l. 14: Scoules (1681), scowles (Q. 1682), Frowns (1682)

l. 22: A general sign (1681), Or general Pique, that (1682), Or general Pique all (Q. 1682)

How are the three texts related? Was Otway constantly revising his own epilogue, or was Betterton, who spoke it, doing that for him? From whom, and in what state, did A. Green and A. Banks receive the texts from which they printed? A satisfactory answer to all those questions may be impossible, but interesting textual data are lying about on every other page of this book waiting to be used. Who shall collate the collations?

On other matters Professor Wiley speaks with more authority, and

indeed she has packed into her pages much useful information on a variety of topics. She claims in her preface to be addressing 'readers who are interested in the theatre, dramatic history, literature, society, politics, rhetoric, oratory, printers and booksellers, poets, actors, and numerous mirrorings of seventeenth century taste'; and such specialist readers—and the far from impossible he or she who is interested in all these matters—will find here much odd and out-of-the-way knowledge. A two-and-a-half-page biography of Dryden ('John Dryden was born at Aldwinkle, All Saints . . .'), and similar sketches of Otway, Shadwell, and other well-known writers seem too great a concession to the general reader; the space might profitably have been used for a further discussion on questions of theatrical and dramatic history, or of seventeenth century taste, on all of which the editor is often illuminating. See, for example, the remarks on Joe Haynes and his donkey and the subsequent discussion of epilogues into which animals were introduced (pp. 199–203); the influence of prologue or epilogue on the seventeenth century 'character' (pp. 233–6); the price paid for prologues (pp. 67–9); the musical prologue (pp. 21, 294–7); prologues or epilogues 'never spoken' (pp. 155–60); on the speaking of prologues by children, mostly girls, which became so common that one writer was driven to remark, about 1682,

'Tis now no Jest to hear young Girls talk Baudy.' (Pp. 233–6.)

In the general introduction Professor Wiley gives a historical sketch of prologues and epilogues, touching more particularly on both the writers and speakers of them, and on their publication. Here, too, she attempts a classification of them, relates them to the tradition of witty conversation in the seventeenth century, and finally considers their significance in the theatre of the period. In this last section she has some interesting observations to make on their effect in adjusting what she calls 'psychic distance' between audience and stage. On the Restoration stage, it is true, actor and audience had already almost parted company; but something at least of the old Elizabethan intimacy was retained in the preliminary parleying of the prologue, and the post-mortem jocosity of the epilogue. The Restoration audience, too, having visited the theatre as much to see itself as the play, must have regarded the prologue as no more than its due, an essential gesture of polite welcome from the professional performers whom it was patronising.

Professor Wiley is accurate in detail, and I have noted few slips.

On p. 350 both page references given for Mrs. Centlivre's *Busie Body* appear to be wrong. On p. xxiv, for 'Mr. Chambers' read 'Sir E. K. Chambers'. On p. 159 the 'Epilogue for Jane Shore. Designed for Mrs. Oldfield' is mentioned without any indication that it is by Pope. Incidentally, one of the pieces listed in Appendix A, 'A Prologue, Sent to Mr. Row, To his new Play, call'd, The Fair Penitent' is not, in fact, a prologue at all, but a scurrilous satire on Rowe's tragedy.

In conclusion, though it would be wrong to suggest that this book falls between the two stools of bibliographical and general interest, it must be added that one or two of the pieces reprinted here (e.g. Settle's feeble prologue to *Pastor Fido*) have little claim to attention beyond their rarity as collectors' items. In a literary genre that has produced so much witty and impudent writing it seems a pity to rake up examples which have little intrinsic value. It is to be hoped that Professor Wiley, who knows her subject thoroughly, may be persuaded to widen her field of research to the whole corpus of seventeenth and eighteenth century prologues and epilogues—irrespective of whether they achieved separate publication or not—and to write a history of them to which the present volume would be no more than a prologue.

The copy of this book sent for review has been mutilated on pp. 309-10 by some perforating instrument for the purpose of stating 'Complimentary Copy. Not for Sale'.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND.

Religious Trends in English Poetry. By HOXIE NEALE FAIRCHILD. Volume I: 1700-1740. Protestantism and the Cult of Sentiment. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1939. Pp. xvi+612. 25s. net.

At the end of their long experience most readers of Professor Fairchild's book will ask how it is that the author of the last two chapters can have failed to see the radical faults of the first ten. Those ten chapters report at length on every poet whom the author can readily lay his hands on (though, incidentally, why does he omit to consider the anonymous translator(s) of the hymns in the Catholic *Primer* of 1700, a book recently edited by Professors Noyes and Potter?). Since religion is the theme and the period what it is—the sixth chapter opens with the remark that 'it is generally admitted that at this time [1720-1740] the emotional and imaginative aspects of Christianity

receded to a lower level than at any other period in English history'—reporting on Christianity in the work of these poets is sometimes as unremunerative as reporting on the incidence of hayfever among Esquimaux. And where the Christian theme exists at all, it usually exists faintly. It will be seen, therefore, that Professor Fairchild soon comes to resemble an unhappy schoolmaster obliged to report on every member of a dull form, many of whom have cut most of his lessons, and to report on them with as much variety of phrase as possible. To make matters worse, Professor Fairchild has small interest in poetry as poetry: when, for example, his grey file brightens with the figure of Matthew Green, he scarcely notices any difference: after *The Spleen*, 'His other poems are few and of small intrinsic value' (p. 348).

In the last two chapters, however, our resentment vanishes. In the former, that on Pope and Thomson, Professor Fairchild finds subject-matter worthy of all the excellent thinking he can do; and in the second, entitled *Protestantism and Sentimentalism*, he undertakes the enormous task of interpreting the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries—for this is what it comes to—as a single historical entity in which 'every point [is related] to every other point'. In the admirable discussion on Pope, Pope is presented comprehensively as one who is 'all things to all men'. Two *bons mots* may be cited:

The most glaring inconsistencies of the *Essay on Man* result from the clash between sentimental and anti-sentimental elements. Not all of the contradictions are to be ascribed to Pope's lack of philosophic insight. Most of them were inherent in the half-latitudinarian, half-deistic cosmology and ethics of his day; some of them had been imbedded in the Chain of Being tradition since the Middle Ages. We should not, on the other hand, represent Pope as an empty-headed scribbler pulled hither by one source and thither by another. He was quite capable of thinking for himself and of becoming independently confused . . . (p. 505);

Universal benevolence acts in the moral as gravitation in the physical world. Unwavering is [Thomson's] belief that

. . . happiness and true philosophy
Are of the social still and smiling kind.

God himself is so social and smiling that one is tempted to compare Him to the last glimpse of the Cheshire Cat in *Alice in Wonderland*: all of Him has faded away except the cosmic grin (p. 521).

It would be impertinent to summarize the final chapter since its 40 tall packed pages are themselves a summary, but one may note

such fertile tenets as 'eighteenth-century sentimentalism is the child of seventeenth-century Protestantism', and 'the romanticism of the 1780-1830 period is simply Protestant Christianity in a more or less delightfully phosphorescent state of decay' (p. 538).

Professor Fairchild has planned four volumes to follow this, and already his 'files contain practically all the material for a closely related sequel covering the period from 1740 to 1780' (p. vii). Those forty years are more interesting than the preceding forty for Professor Fairchild's purposes. But since he speaks of a condition—'if the needful years and health are granted me . . . '—may we not plead with him to read his files but not to trouble to print them, to embody their grain but not their chaff in a single sequel covering the two centuries which he has planned to cover?

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

Methodism and the Literature of the Eighteenth Century.

By T. B. SHEPHERD. London: The Epworth Press. Pp. 286. 10s. 6d. net.

The Methodism of John Wesley has been called the Romantic Movement within the Christian Church in England: 'It was the field—the vast open field—where Christianity and Romanticism met in a natural and creative fraternity.'¹ It is a pity that this aspect has not been more widely appreciated and that too little attention in the past has been paid to the coincidence, in point of time, of the Methodist and Romantic revivals. The links between them—on examination—are surprisingly close. Both represent renaissance and rebirth in English life and a new quickening and efflorescence; and in both there is a distinct swinging away from contemporary convention and sterility. The fire and light of Blake, for example, are not far removed from Wesley's 'warmed heart' and the incandescence of Methodism; Cowper was a Calvinistic Methodist influenced by John Newton; the Cradle Songs of Isaac Watts, the Odes of Collins, and Smart's *Song to David* are closely allied, along with the well-knit prose of the early Methodist Preachers—like Traherne in places, the lyrics of Charles Wesley, and, later, the homely muse and fierce emotion of Burns, and the radiance of Shelley. No purely literary evaluation can do justice to this richer and wider pattern of Romanticism, for it was social as well as poetic; ethical and profoundly spiritual as well as cultural.

¹ *The Times Literary Supplement*, September 4, 1937.

But there were also closer and more precise affinities. There was, for instance, the new climate of emotion and the new emphasis on feeling—not the maudlin sentiment of Richardson and Mackenzie, although Methodism produced it, too, in James Hervey and Henry Brooke—but the sensitivity which we find alike in the hymns of Charles Wesley and the poems of Blake and Coleridge. There was again the new human emphasis: Rousseau's doctrine of personality on the one hand and Wesley's unfailing interest in the individual on the other. Brunetière's 'emancipation of the Ego' is found in the Methodist re-assertion of personality. We meet it again in Wordsworth, Blake, and Shelley. In both movements it led to new social pity and moral earnestness, and contributed to the wide humanitarian reforms which followed. Thirdly, there was the new habit of language. We think immediately of Wordsworth's Prefaces, but there is a Preface of striking similarity, twenty years earlier, in Wesley's 1779 hymnbook, with much the same plea for 'the utmost simplicity and plainness, suited to every capacity', to which may be added Wesley's frequent injunctions to his Preachers to cultivate a familiar style: 'the use of the most common, little, easy words (so they be pure and proper), which our language affords'. Though Wordsworth first gave the new method definition as a literary principle Wesley anticipated him by twenty years. Fourthly, there are the hymns; far too many, it is true, and of unequal merit, but revealing new lyrical moods and wide metrical variety, and closely linked to the new poetry of the period. We forget Wesley set England singing, and part of his phenomenal success was due to this revival within the movement of mystical poetry and song. There is a distinct return to the colour and imagery of the Metaphysicals, particularly in the hymns on the Passion. Hardly anything earlier in the eighteenth century is so rich and daring. Charles Wesley must be counted among the innovators. After the formalism of Dryden and Pope he heralds the new order, anticipating the richer rhythms of Blake and the Romantics. And in this connection it is worth noting that, contrary to Sir Leslie Stephen's surprising judgment, the Tractarian movement gave to English literature nothing either in quality or range to compare with the Methodist lyrics.

Many of these and other features are discussed at length by Dr. Shepherd, although he takes a cautious view of Wesley's attitude to nature, and overlooks, I think, the natural charm of the Georgian *Journal* and Wesley's specific advice, in a sermon on Family Religion,

on the early introduction of children to nature. But Dr. Shepherd recognizes, in this connection, the contribution of Wesley's Preachers. Their autobiographies, so rich in mysticism, so clear and sober in style, and so surprisingly full of incident and adventure, deserve wider recognition, and a published selection in a modern edition is long overdue. Dr. Shepherd also pays high tribute to Cowper and Blake. The former, a Methodist, anticipated Wordsworth. There is the same faith, the same craving for simplicity, the same love of man and nature, although Wordsworth shows far greater vigour. As for Blake, 'the fact', says Dr. Shepherd, 'is seldom recognized that the greatest poet of the Evangelical revival was William Blake'. This judgment is important and may in course of time lead to considerable re-valuation.

Dr. Shepherd's book is an invaluable study in its own field. It shows great care and wide reading. He combines strict impartiality with intense enthusiasm for his subject, and at no point draws unfair or artificial conclusions: his tendency rather is to err on the side of caution. The result is a work of great balance and restraint. It makes fascinating reading, too, touching, as it does, almost every aspect of the cultural life of the century. More space perhaps might have been devoted to the hymns of the Wesleys, which are given no more, in fact, than Wesley's political and controversial works, and also to the actual beginnings of the Romantic Revival. There appears to be no mention of Crabbe, and hardly any, outside footnotes, of Coleridge and Burns. Dr. Shepherd seems also to have overlooked Wesley's essay on Taste; and Dr. J. A. Swallow's *Methodism in the Light of the English Literature of the Last Century*, published in Leipzig in 1895, is not included in the very considerable bibliography. On the other hand there is a full and valuable account of the Early Preachers, a comprehensive chapter on the writers of the period, and an excellent summing up. Dr. Shepherd makes generous acknowledgment to other recent writers in the same field. He is careful also to emphasize the Anglican tendencies of Wesley and his first followers; and he has shown what cannot be declared too often, that Methodism in its origins was a watershed of unusual fertility in English life. From every point of view this book is a notable addition to the literature dealing with early Methodism.

F. C. GILL.

The Rise of Romantic Hellenism in English Literature, 1732-1786. By B. H. STERN. Published for the author by the George Banta Publishing Company, Wisconsin. 1940. Pp. x+182. \$2.25.

Dr. Stern is to be congratulated on his choice of subject; he has opened for us a most interesting and significant chapter in the history of Comparative Literature; his book is an inquiry into the origins of neo-hellenism.

It appears that the mid-eighteenth century grew tired of the restraint and formalism of the Augustan Age, but instead of renouncing the whole classical tradition, they widened and improved on it so as to include the idealism, sentiment, and aspirations of their own modern civilization. And since Rome had for so long been the centre of interest, they turned to Hellas. Dr. Stern does well to remind us that this movement, in its origin, was no sudden pose or fashion. On the contrary it arose out of a new and studious curiosity in archæology, art, and ancient history. In *Antiquities of Ionia* we read: 'In the year 1734 some gentlemen who had travelled in Italy, desirous of encouraging at home a taste for those objects which had contributed so much to their entertainment abroad, formed themselves into a society under the name of *The Dilettanti*'. Partly thanks to the influence of this organization, scholars and humanists began to explore Greece, Egypt and The Troad, and to write charming travel books on what they had seen or investigated. No doubt both writers and readers enjoyed these activities with all the more zest because Englishmen found that life in their own cloudy and faction-ridden country was more confined and less elevating than Addison had imagined.

At about the same time Winckelmann published his *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* (to which Dr. Stern does less justice than to its author's career) and the German's ideas and enthusiasms were popularized by Fuseli (or Füssli), Bielfeld, Knox, Kirshaw, Gillies, and contested by Sir Joshua Reynolds.

This review of influences and experiences, leads up to the essential theme, the stay-at-home writers who caught the spirit of the Grecians, and brought Hellenism into their prose, and especially their verses—Thomson, Glover, Dyer, Akenside, Joseph and Thomas Warton, Collins, Gray, Mason and others. While discussing first the travellers and then the poets, Dr. Stern quotes fully and yet judiciously to prove that both groups of writers were rather carried away by their own impulse to admire. They read into Greek history, scenery and

culture all that they could not find in their own civilization. Antiquity became for them a second and more spiritual life. That is why Dr. Stern's book is entitled *Romantic Hellenism*, and why, in the midst of the eighteenth century, we can enjoy (according to him) a foretaste of what our greatest poets were to discover and celebrate in the nineteenth. In fact he ends his inquiry with these words, 'When the results of this study are borne in mind, the reader of *Prometheus Unbound*, *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* and *Don Juan* will possess a deeper understanding and find a keener pleasure in the ideas which these poems express. Certainly, the *Ode on a Grecian Urn* should have for him an enriched and more profound meaning, for it is the product of a long and interesting development.'

This essay in research did not need any such specious recommendation. One does not appreciate a very great poem any the more for knowing that the subject (not the theme) is to some degree second-hand. *Romantic Hellenism* will be read on its own merits as a side-light on eighteenth century humanism and on the beginnings of a cult which lasted till Butcher's *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius* in 1891. It is the duty of modern scholars to accumulate and adjust knowledge, and any such adjustment has its own value. And if, as in this case, the facts were not unknown, though unfamiliar, it is all the more incumbent on their organizer to interpret their tendency. So Dr. Stern was justified in emphasizing the note of idealization which foreshadows, if it does not anticipate, one notable strain in the poetry of the Romantic Movement.

Yet it is to be feared that Dr. Stern, though aiming very much in the right direction, has rather overshot the mark. He proves by excerpts that romantic hellenists greatly admired in Hellas the spirit of freedom, the sense of beauty (whether expressed in architecture or sculpture), the Arcadian scenery, the climate bathed in sunlight; and then, again and again, he insists on the tendency 'to read into the remains of Ancient Greece that which was not necessarily there'. Of course, all writers are inclined to show that their subject is well worth writing about. For instance, Milton found grandeur and spaciousness in Hell, Sir Thomas Browne found wisdom in an old British burial urn. But allowing for such partiality and the occasional over-emphasis of rhetoric, these eighteenth century Grecians read very little into Greece which was or is not there. Ancient Greek art and literature (even in the relics which have survived) really are among the greatest masterpieces of all time, and retain the supreme

virtue of originality, however often they are studied. The Athenians and Spartans really did prove to the world that it was better to risk all rather than submit to a conqueror. The scenery, though far less wooded than in ancient days, still exercises a weird and yet tranquilizing spell. And if the eighteenth century humanists endued it with Arcadian charm, they were relying not on their undocumented imaginations, but on the evidence of Theocritus, Bion, Moschus, not to mention many choric passages in Euripides and even Sophocles. The country is dotted with ruins which really are romantic or picturesque; for these dismantled or dismembered skeletons still have tongues and tell us what a great nation once prized and then lost; and modern commentators are no more sentimentalists than Herodotus in the opening chapter of his *History*, though their styles may be more exuberant. The climate is still the brightest and most stimulating in the world; and as for the state of the modern Greeks, under the Turks it was outrageous, and even now, under their own rulers, they are about the poorest nation in Europe.

In fact one cannot help thinking that Dr. Stern knows much about romantic hellenists, but little about the Hellenic culture which inspired them. Otherwise he would have understood that the spirit of ancient Greece has played upon our sentiments and intellects from at least the age of Dante onwards simply because this influence is not (as in the cult of medieval chivalry, renaissance pastoralism or the modern 'return to nature') a case of wishful thinking. The great civilizers of Greece were logicians or realists, gifted with eloquence, who actually did try to give to their contemporaries what we desire them to give to us.

If that be so, these hellenists need not be considered less romantic, but romanticism must be interpreted and applied more broadly.

H. V. ROUTH.

Coleridge Fille, a Biography of Sara Coleridge. By EARL LESLIE GRIGGS. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1940. Pp. xiv+259. 12s. 6d. net.

It was high time that Sara Coleridge should find a biographer since there was no more recent book about her than her daughter's *Memoir and Letters*, published in 1873. Thus Professor Earl Griggs has filled a genuine gap by his interesting and painstaking volume. Sara Coleridge inherited a full share of her father's gifts: without the genius of Hartley or the pedestrian virtues of Derwent, she combined

in her person not a little of the talent of the one and the common-sense and steadiness of purpose of the other. She was among the most learned women of her day, perhaps the best scholar of them all. She was also what her biographer likes to call typical of the feminine virtues, while possessing breadth of mind and intellectual ability not commonly associated with these. She was besides remarkably beautiful both as child and woman, and seemed to lack nothing but physical robustness and a good constitution. She suffered at least as much as her brothers from her parents' incompatibility of temperament—probably more, since it was her fate to live until her marriage in Southey's household, where, in spite of his benevolence, she felt her dependence as a poor relation. It says much for her sweetness of disposition that, though she was unable to overcome her consequent melancholy, she was beloved by all with whom she came in contact both at home and abroad, and notably with everyone at Rydal Mount. Her critical faculty is shown by her just estimates of the relative and intrinsic greatness of her father and of Wordsworth as well as of other writers, great and small, whom it was her privilege to meet. Professor Griggs brings out the strength of her own powers, creative, theological and critical, but he does not overrate her original writings. Nor will any qualified reader deny that it is her editorial labours that constitute her chief claim to remembrance. For once, Mrs. Wordsworth was wrong, and the world has reason to be thankful that 'poor dear indefatigable Sara' refused to leave her father's memory and works alone. Never did any daughter contribute so handsomely to a poet's fame, and we owe to her efforts much of his prose that might otherwise have perished or have been overlooked for many years. It would be difficult to overrate the value of her edition of Coleridge's writings, distinguished as it is by discernment and by thoroughness.

Professor Griggs has also been able to contribute facts about Coleridge and his wife which present them both and also their relations to each other in a fresh light. It is manifested that Mrs. Coleridge was not the stupid and tiresome person that she has often been made to appear. Nor was the poet grossly neglectful of his duty to her and to their children. It is, of course, true that husband and wife were hopelessly unsuited to one another, and that this incompatibility made domestic life together impossible, especially after Coleridge's infatuation for Sarah Hutchinson—which was also the underlying, though not the final cause of the rupture with Wordsworth in 1810.

Mrs. Coleridge gained and retained the respect as well as the affection of all her children to whom she devoted herself in very difficult circumstances. Her daughter, especially, was deeply attached to her mother, from whom she was seldom separated for long, even after her marriage. It is pleasant to learn that when they both lived in London, husband and wife were reconciled by their daughter's efforts, and that during his last years they saw much of each other and seem to have enjoyed talking over their early days together and their friendship with Poole.

Coleridge, too, is shown to have been actively interested in his children's education and to have contributed as far as he was able to their maintenance. There has never been any question about his distress at his separation from them. He and his daughter were scarcely acquainted before she reached maturity, but when they met their intimacy was founded not only on mutual affection but also on the similarity of taste and interests which bound them more than commonly close together. Her relations with both her parents and her understanding love for them are not the least of Sara Coleridge's attractive qualities.

EDITH J. MORLEY.

The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth. Poems written in Youth. Poems Referring to the Period of Childhood. Ed. from the MSS. with textual and critical notes by E. de Selincourt. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1940. Pp. xvi+379. 21s. net.

Professor de Selincourt is crowning his labours on Wordsworth by the edition of the poet's works of which this volume is the first instalment. He has had the advantage of access to all existing manuscripts and revisions by Wordsworth himself so that he is able to do for the other writings what was so admirably achieved by his edition of *The Prelude* in 1926. While the text is that of the last edition (1849-50) supervised by Wordsworth, the *apparatus criticus* records 'its development from the earliest existing copy, through its successive stages in manuscript and print, till it received its final revision'. Consequently we are now supplied with full means to estimate the growth—or decline—of the poet's mind, not only during the formative years as recorded by himself in *The Prelude*, but also throughout his life. The results may surprise those who assume that there was a decline of power after 1807 or 1815, or some other selected date, or

that Wordsworth obstinately rejected the advice of friends and foes when it involved verbal or other changes in what he had written, or, even more wrong-headed, that he lacked the power of self-criticism and neglected attention to details of style. For the truth of his own claim to his publisher in 1836 is proved up to the hilt: 'No one can estimate the labour that I have bestowed on correcting the style according to my best judgment.' No poet, not even Pope or Tennyson, ever paid more attention to the minutiae of style or the perfecting of his lines.

Wordsworth was continually correcting and changing details—not invariably for the better. As his present editor phrases it, 'He had the true artist's passion for perfection', and consequently he devoted 'endless pains to the revision of earlier work'. Unfortunately, the changes introduced affected the meaning as well as the style, often with the result that there is a palpable difference in tone and point of view between the original and later versions. 'There is always a risk in tampering in cold blood with "the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings" and some of the changes introduced in his middle years bear evidence of this—changes which he later discarded in favour of his earlier text.'

These successive alterations in the text raise at once a serious editorial problem. How are the poems to be classified and arranged? Every reader of Wordsworth must at some time have suffered from the difficulty of finding a particular title and have had reason to complain of the poet's illogical classification. The alternatives are 'to print the poems in the order either of their composition or of their publication or to devise a completely new system' of arrangement. The last of these may be ruled out as obviously unsatisfactory. The order of composition at first sight appears attractive. But it is, in fact, the worst method possible. Not only does it contravene Wordsworth's strongly expressed opinion, but there are the difficulties of determining the right chronological order which arise from his methods of composition. The dates of publication do not correspond with the dates of production; in many cases the composition extended over a period of years; in many others the form of the first draft differs essentially from that of later versions, so that, if a chronological arrangement be attempted, a wholly false impression will be given of the poet's artistic and mental development unless the earliest available text be printed. 'To give the 1850 text of the *Prelude* with the date 1805, or *Guilt and Sorrow* as Wordsworth revised it in 1842,

with the date 1791-5, or many of the poems printed in 1807 in their revised text but with the date of their composition, is not conducive to an intelligent study of the poet's art.'

However reluctantly, one must agree that Dr. de Selincourt's decision to retain Wordsworth's own classification and order is incontrovertibly right, since it cannot be improved upon; and 'since he gave it much thought and set some store by it, it is, in a measure, illuminative of his mind'. For the poet held that 'the only thing of much importance in arrangement is that one poem should shade off happily into another, and the contrasts, where they occur, be clear of all harshness or abruptness,' and it was to this principle that he adhered in the sequence he adopted.

To read the poems in that order and to supplement their study by a detailed examination of the variants now available is the most satisfactory approach to the growth of Wordsworth's mind and art. Dr. de Selincourt provides further assistance by his annotations which not only deal with the poet's diction and stylistic borrowings in such a way as to trace the literary influences under which he had come, but also provide much explanatory matter of various kinds. Most startling perhaps, is that which is unobtrusively conveyed on the penultimate page. Here we are given proof that Wordsworth wrote Part II—and presumably also Part I—of *The Three Graves*, Parts III and IV of which were of course written and published by Coleridge in 1809. Wordsworth told Barron Field, 'I gave him the subject of his *Three Graves*,' but not until the publication of Part II among the *Juvenilia* in this volume (p. 308) and the editor's explanatory note has it ever been surmised that Wordsworth had himself tried and abandoned the theme because it was 'too shocking and painful.'

There are other interesting attempts among the *Juvenilia*, some imitating classical models (e.g. the adaptation of the *Sparrow* of Catullus); others obviously indebted to Milton (e.g. *The Dog—An Idyllium*, beginning

Where were ye, nymphs, when the remorseless deep
Clos'd o'er your little favourite's hapless head ?)

or Collins or Thomson or Gray. But far the most interesting debt is that to contemporary supernaturalism as evinced in the *Fragment of a Gothic Tale* and in the following fragment, apparently a first treatment of 'part of the tale originally designed for the *Female Vagrant*.' Both these fragments are written in a debased Spenserian

stanza, and both show the youthful poet under the influence of the tales of terror and wonder which were so vital a factor in eighteenth century romanticism in both prose and verse.

Most instructive of all, however, is a study of the variants in the texts of *An Evening Walk*, *Descriptive Sketches*, *Guilt and Sorrow* and *The Borderers*. Here again the reader will owe much to the editor's illuminating commentary as well as to the changes recorded by him in the *apparatus criticus*. The alterations in these four principal works of Wordsworth's youth reflect the growth of his mind and art in no uncertain fashion, and as a revelation of his development they are of outstanding importance.

It is therefore no exaggeration to say that Dr. de Selincourt's edition of *The Poetical Works*, as represented by this, the first volume, reaches the high-water mark of critical understanding of Wordsworth the man and the poet.

EDITH J. MORLEY.

The Burning Oracle. Studies in the Poetry of Action. By G. WILSON KNIGHT. London, New York, and Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. viii+292. 12s. 6d. net.

The Imperial Theme. By G. WILSON KNIGHT. (Oxford Bookshelf Series.) London, New York, and Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. xii+367. 6s. net.

In his new volume Professor Wilson Knight applies his well-known method of interpretation to five other writers besides Shakespeare: Spenser, Milton, Swift, Pope, and Byron. The results are interesting to anyone who feels the fascination of that method, but are perhaps less exciting and more tentative than usual. The tentativeness is acknowledged—'I admit that I do not feel at home here', he says of the *Faerie Queene*; and may also be deduced (especially in the essay on Spenser) from a greater readiness to draw help from other critics (as various in approach as Miss Spens, Mr. Davis, and Mr. Lewis) to set the poet in his age, and to form relative and comparative judgments. On the whole these essays are more merely descriptive than his earlier Shakespearian criticism; they are happiest on technique, and (valuable to the student) on how to read, how to *hear* certain passages. But the old illumination, if more fitful, is intense; for example: 'Never is Pope happier than when writing in terms of ritual.' It may be partly the inclusion in the volume of a single essay on Shakespeare that puts the other essays on the level of introductions

or trial notes. 'The Shakespearian Integrity' is an epitome of Professor Knight's earlier volumes on Shakespeare, but it is more than that, for there is a clearer view of Shakespeare's total achievement, he is seen more often in relation to his age and his dramatic contemporaries, and there is throughout a closer touch with the common reader.

The same author's book, *The Imperial Theme* (1931) now joins *The Wheel of Fire* (1930) in the Oxford Bookshelf series at a lower price.

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON.

The Place-names of Wiltshire. By J. E. B. GOVER, ALLEN MAWER and F. M. STENTON. (English Place-name Society, Volume XVI.) Cambridge; at the University Press. 1939. Pp. xli + 547-22s. 6d. net.

The Celtic element is probably the most interesting and striking discovery in this volume. Names of British origin are more prominent in Wiltshire than in any county so far treated, with the possible exception of Devonshire. These names are mainly those of hills, woods or forests, and rivers, many of them so ancient that no certain explanation can be offered. Today, they are often names of parishes, and the frequency of such elements as *penn*, *chet*, *cors*, etc., and the occurrence of various hybrid compounds, make it clear that some Britons, at least, survived the first impact of the Saxon invasion and, in the period of peaceful intercourse which followed, the conquerors adopted part of the topographical vocabulary of their defeated foes. Other traces of this British population are probably to be found in Walcot, Wallen, Wallmead, a lost Walton in Downton, and in Britford near Salisbury. This strong Celtic influence suggests that Wiltshire was not occupied by the Saxons in the earliest and most destructive phase of the conquest.

Tradition, archæology and place-names give the same impression that the English occupation of Wiltshire did not begin before the middle of the sixth century. Names such as Wansdyke, Waden Hill, and others now lost, shew that Saxon heathenism was a powerful and active force at the time of the occupation, but the conversion of Wessex did not begin until 634. Wiltshire place-names have very few of the characteristic ancient features which distinguish those of such counties as Sussex, Kent and Essex. As in most counties, we find a few English elements which have not been noted previously (p. xvii). The Scandinavian element is slight, as also is the Norman-

French. The feudal element, however, as in all the south-western counties except Cornwall, is very strong. A Norman baron's name is often added to an English or British parish name as in Stanton St. Quintin or Fonthill Giffard, or sometimes survives alone, as in Fitzurse Fm, earlier *Langley Fitzurs*, where one *Urso* was under-tenant of the manor of Langley in 1086. There are five examples of *-ton* added to a French name, e.g. Flamston, earlier *Flambardeston*.

The articles on Innox, Ludgershall, Stonehenge and Sevington are of special interest. *Sarum* still remains a mystery. Thingley points to some forgotten assembly, Damerham to some early law-court, Drake North to a dragon-hoard or treasure. The field-names receive particularly full treatment, among the new terms dealt with being *hitching*, *lain*, *sleight*, *smoke*, *stitch* and *stitching*. Full lists, indexes and maps are provided, as usual, in a volume which will long remain the standard work on this county.

P. H. REANEY.

Essays by Divers Hands (being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom). New Series, vol. XVIII. Edited by ST. JOHN ERVINE. London: Oxford University Press. 1940. Pp. xvi+165. 7s. net.

The *Essays by Divers Hands* of the Royal Society of Literature is an English institution comparable with the *Essays and Studies* of the English Association. Both provide useful means for the publication of critical work which is intermediate in weight and length between the serious magazine article and the monograph. It is to be hoped that wartime difficulties will not impede the continuation of either of these admirable series. The *Essays and Studies* are addressed mainly to teachers and students of English literature, and therefore tend to be somewhat specialized and technical. The *Essays by Divers Hands* seem on the contrary to aim at interesting the 'general educated public', and they have a fine tradition of broadness of appeal and catholicity, which is well maintained by the eighteenth volume of the New Series. Of the seven essays in the volume, four, as Mr. St. John Ervine points out in his lively and stimulating introduction, 'have some concern with the recurring inquiry, "What is Truth?"', or, in other words, are attempts at philosophical criticism. The other three may be described as historical and antiquarian. The most solid and scholarly contribution to the collection belongs to the latter category. It is Dr. Robin Flower's masterly

Gifford Edmonds Memorial Lecture on *Lost Manuscripts*, a fascinating account of recent achievements of scholarship in recovering lost manuscripts of the past and the methods by which these successes have been achieved. In the Tredegar Lecture for 1938, Mr. Richard Church, writing with the authority of an experienced practitioner, discusses with much charm but no great originality the relationship between the lyric and the novel. His conclusion appears to be that the 'form' of a lyric is, or can be, the same as that of a novel. If this is all that 'form' means, surely it has little value as a critical term. Dr. Percy Spielmann in a paper on 'The effect of Scientific Thought on the Arts and Literature' and Mr. Michael Roberts, in his Tredegar Lecture for 1939, both deal in some measure with the difficult problems connected with 'Modernist' Art. Dr. Spielmann has chosen a magnificent subject, but his treatment of it is disappointing. His ten pages of rather ponderous argument seem to lead only to the conclusions that 'modernist' art has been affected in various ways by scientific progress and that art of this kind does not produce what Dr. Spielmann calls 'beauty'. 'Who, to-day,' he asks, 'can paint flowers as well as the Seventeenth Century Dutch?' As Mr. St. John Ervine pertinently remarks, such a question shows 'some misunderstanding of life itself.' Mr. Michael Roberts deals valiantly with a lofty but difficult theme, taking as his text a phrase from the Marquess of Crewe's definition of the aims of the Royal Society of Literature. His remarks on education are particularly penetrating, and the Society would do well to ponder his question, 'What are we doing to build up a competent, critical public to replace the dwindling upper class public?' In contrast with Dr. Spielmann's sweeping denunciation of the moderns. Mr. Roberts wisely condemns the double fallacy, which he defines as 'the belief that a simulacrum of the good literature of the past is good literature' and the 'fatal and fatalistic superstition that posterity will do our work for us'. Mr. Yusuf Ali's vigorous and illuminating essay on 'The Doctrine of Personality in Iqbal's Poetry' is an account of the philosophy of an Indian Moslem poet illustrated by some striking quotations, which suggest to the Western reader a genius akin to that of Nietzsche.

V. DE S. PINTO.

SHORT NOTICES

The Arts and the Art of Criticism. By THEODORE MEYER GREENE. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1940. Pp. xxx+690. \$5.00, 30s. net.

The philosopher determined to put the arts in their place is a terrifying creature, and his writings are numerous. Professor Greene, however, approaches the perennial problem of the classification and analysis of the arts from an unusually modest direction. He is himself a practising artist as well as an authority on Plato, Kant, and the Philosophy of Art. He is humility itself in allowing experts in the various arts to help him, and is generous in his acknowledgment to those authorities in English literature who have suggested classification and given him guidance. Messrs. A. E. Hinds, D. A. Stauffer, and C. W. Kennedy in English, and Dr. Erwin Panofsky in Art History are good guarantors of his sanity and perspective. His method is to explore the six arts in turn, 'with special reference to their respective media, their several types of formal organization, and their expressive potentialities and limitations'. This is done in terms of the arts themselves, with copious illustration. Seekers after clarity will note with grateful relief that 'such traditional problems as the generic character of the æsthetic experience, the subjectivity or objectivity of æsthetic quality in its various manifestations, and the significance of art and beauty viewed in large philosophical perspective, have been dealt with very cursorily.' The plan is excellent, everything is examined at first-hand, in the best tradition of Lessing—the raw material and the artistic medium of each art isolated, dissected, displayed and synthesized. The relevant and irrelevant factors of each art are clearly set out, as site, ornament and interior decoration for architecture, the problems of sign, symbol, and word, together with verbal tonality and metaphorical considerations in literature, and the bodily factors in the art of the dance. It is probably the most objective book on the arts ever written by a professed philosopher. The proof of an æsthetician's pudding lies in the illustrating, and the 299 pictures which follow the 500 pages of text present the most unhackneyed and intelligently selected anthology of the arts I have yet come across. Bracketed between Frank Lloyd Wright's 'Project for a Warehouse' and Doris Humphrey's study in dance-grouping and lighting, 'With My Red Fires', we find Bernardo Belotto's 'Gardens of Schönbrunn', Fonthill Abbey, Corot's 'Chartres Cathedral' confronting a photograph from the same angle, the Ishtar Gate of Babylon, Mendelssohn's Schocken Store in Chemnitz, Brancusi's 'Bird in Space', Pozzo's S. Ignazio Ceiling in Rome, drawings by Bernini, Poussin, and Callot, a jungle scene by Rousseau le Douanier, as well as the familiar joys of Giorgione's 'Tempest', Van Gogh's 'Portrait of a Chair', Hogarth's 'Marriage A La Mode' and Breughel's 'Blind leading the Blind'. The book is equally valuable as an introduction to the problem and as a digestive after a grand banquet of the arts.

J. I.

Fifteenth Century Translation as an Influence on English Prose. (Princeton Studies in English, No. 18.) By SAMUEL K. WORKMAN. Princeton: Princeton University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. 1940. Pp. viii+210. 12s. net.

Mr. Workman is concerned to show that the habit of translation from mediæval Latin or contemporary French in the fifteenth century was a valuable discipline in training English writers in the management of the long sentence. He describes the translators' method as 'stencil translation': they follow their model, not only word for word, but in the construction of the sentence. He notices, with many illustrations, that a translator, when left to himself—as, for example, in writing a preface—

will often fail to bind a complex sentence together except by loose connectives; he composes 'by narrow units', instead of seeing and expressing the logical sequence of the whole sentence clearly, and will even make an occasional anacoluthon. So far Mr. Workman establishes his point convincingly. He allows that his further point, that translation taught the Englishman the art of sentence construction when he was writing original matter, is more difficult to prove; partly because translators have commonly left little of their own independent work. The many impossible Latin forms in Mr. Workman's book—*inferantur cordio* (for *inserantur cordi*), *Regulum Benedicti, lapiei, licit, De quatuor novissima*—suggest unfamiliarity with that language. It must also be added that 'planographic reproduction of author's manuscript' is tiring to read.

F. E. H.

A Treatise of Melancholie. By T. BRIGHT. Reproduced from the 1586 edition printed by Thomas Vautrollier, with an introduction by HARDIN CRAIG. Published for the Facsimile Text Society, by Columbia University Press, New York. London: H. Milford. 1940. Pp. xxiv+xxiv (facsunites)+286. 17s. 6d. net.

Timothy Bright's *Treatise of Melancholie*, twice printed in 1586 and again in 1613, is a book of importance in the study of the Elizabethan background, for the 'melancholie humour' so prevalent at the end of the sixteenth century was something more than a passing mood. Hamlet was quite serious in his fear that his father's ghost might have been a hallucination caused by his own melancholy; such hallucinations were regarded as normal symptoms of the disease in its extremest stages. Bright's treatise is therefore worth studying. He was a doctor of physic; and on September 20, 1584, he was appointed by the Governor of St. Bartholomew's Hospital on probation 'to serve and practise upon the poor of this house in physic.' The book is thus the work of a reputable practitioner, and a valuable comment on the theory and practice of medicine. Bright was particularly interested in the relation of diet to disease and mental states; but, as with most learned men of his time, his theories were a medley of common sense, theology, and wild fantasy. The present facsimile has been reproduced from a copy in the Huntington Library; it is everywhere clear and legible. Professor Hardin Craig has prefaced the volume with an interesting note on Bright's theories, and the bibliography of the book.

G. B. HARISON.

On Reading Shakespeare. By M. R. RIDLEY. (Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy 1940.) London: H. MILFORD. 1940. Pp. 31. 2s. net.

The first half of Mr. Ridley's lecture reviews the advantages enjoyed by the reader of Shakespeare, who is hampered neither by the inappropriateness to Elizabethan dramatic conventions of the modern stage, nor by the imaginative loss inevitable through the mediation of the actor, nor by the necessity for keeping pace with the spoken word. This is a defensible point of view, provided it is remembered that the plays were never intended for scrutiny in the study, but it is sufficiently obvious to need little demonstration and, partly on this account and partly because of some hazardous generalizations on Shakespeare and the 'new realism' in Shakespearean criticism, Mr. Ridley's approach to his subject hangs fire. In the latter part of his lecture he concentrates more profitably on one aspect of reading Shakespeare—the necessity for constant awareness that many words which are still current have changed in meaning since Shakespeare's time and cannot be taken at their present value without bankrupting sense and poetry. 'Presently', 'from', 'rapture', 'luxurious', 'wit', 'sense', 'motion', 'sad', 'nice', 'owe' are a few of the forty or fifty examples he cites, and they are, of course, only a few of the many hundred pitfalls for the unwary. What Mr. Ridley has to say on this subject is interesting and valuable and it cannot be said too often until readers of Shakespeare are as language-conscious as they are character-conscious.

ALICE WALKER.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY ALICE WALKER

DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL, Vol. XXXIII., No. 1, December 1940—

Further letters of George Darley, 1795-1846 (C. Colleer Abbott),
pp. 25-45.

A note on the word 'eternity' (James Drever), pp. 48-53.

Some notes on 'An Elizabethan Poem about Durham' (Madeleine
Hope Dodds), pp. 65-7.

Supplementary to *D.U.J.*, Vol. xxxii, pp. 161-8.

Southeyana (W. L. Renwick), pp. 67-9.

Extracts from letters of Southey to the Rev. W. L. Bowles.

— No. 2, March 1941—

Oliver Goldsmith's influence on the French stage (A. Lytton Sells),
pp. 86-101.

Prognosis on a Shakespeare problem (A. P. Rossiter), pp. 126-39.

On the possible significance of the recently found annotations in a copy of
Hall's Chronicle.

ELH, Vol. VII., No. 4, December 1940—

A note in defence of satire (Louis I. Bredvold), pp. 253-64.

Pope's contributions to the *Lintot Miscellanies* of 1712 and 1714
(Robert K. Root), pp. 265-71.

Shakespeare in Iceland: an historical survey (Stefán Einarsson),
pp. 272-85.

Shakespeare's old men (L. Wardlaw Miles), pp. 286-99.

Some recent trends in Shakespearean staging (Calvin D. Linton),
pp. 300-24.

Hazlitt and Northcote (Stewart C. Wilcox), pp. 325-32.

Is Wordsworth's nature-poetry antiquated? (Ernest Bernbaum),
pp. 333-40.

Coleridge and Kant's two worlds (Arthur O. Lovejoy), pp. 341-62.

HISTORY, Vol. XXV., No. 99, December 1940—

A saga of the Anglo-Saxons (C. L. Wrenn), pp. 208-15.

On the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* entry for 755 (Cynewulf and Cyneheard).

LIBRARY, Vol. XXI., No. 2, September 1940—

The Resurreccion of the Masse, by Hugh Hilarie—or John Bale?
(Christina Garrett), pp. 143-59.

- A. E. Housman: an annotated check-list (John Carter and John Sparrow), pp. 160-91.
- Three issues of *A Buckler against the Fear of Death* (Herman R. Mead), pp. 199-206.
- 'Minerva Press' publicity: a publisher's advertisement of 1794 (Michael Sadleir), pp. 207-15.
- An advertisement of thirty-eight Minerva novels, published by William Lane.
- MEDIUM ÆVUM, Vol. IX., No. 3, October 1940—
- The etymology and meaning of *Boy* (E. J. Dobson), pp. 121-54.
- MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LVI., No. 1, January 1941—
- Tobias Smollett and the *Universal History* (Louis L. Martz), pp. 1-14.
- Sidney's metaphor of the ulcer (D. W. Robertson), pp. 56-61.
- On Sidney's conception of tragedy and misleading associations with Italian renaissance interpretations of catharsis.
- Seventeenth-century publishing economy (Ray O. Hummel, Jr.), pp. 61-2.
- 'On the new forcers of conscience', line 17 (Donald C. Dorian), pp. 62-4.
- Botargo*, an English ghost-word (William A. Read), pp. 65-6.
- An error for *botargo* (a variety of caviare) in Bernard Romans's description of West Florida, 1772.
- Is Chaucer's monk a monk? (J. S. P. Tatlock), p. 80.
- A reply to E. P. Kuhl; see *M.L.N.*, Vol. LV (1940), p. 480; further correspondence from Ramona Bressie, *M.L.N.*, February 1941, pp. 161-2.
- No. 2, February 1941—
- The dual time-scheme in Chaucer's *Troilus* (Henry W. Sams), pp. 94-100.
- Diderot and Donne's *Βιαθάνατος* (Roger B. Oake), pp. 114-5.
- A prose period in Shakespeare's career? (Llewellyn M. Buell), pp. 118-22.
- A note on the stage history of Beaumont and Fletcher's *Love's Pilgrimage* and *The Chances* (William C. Powell), pp. 122-7.
- New source influence on *The Shoemaker's Holiday* (W. L. Halstead), pp. 127-9.
- Donne's Suicides (Don Cameron Allen), pp. 129-33.
- An early eighteenth-century rhymed paraphrase of *Paradise Lost*, II. 1-225 (M. Maurice Shudofsky), pp. 133-4.
- Disraeli and John Gibson Lockhart (C. L. Cline), pp. 134-7.
- The friendship of Chaucer's Summoner and Pardoner (Charles R. Sleeth), p. 138.
- No. 3, March 1941—
- Three notes on the text of the *Canterbury Tales* (Carleton Brown), pp. 163-75.
- The textual evidence for 'the School of Night' (Ernest A. Strathmann), pp. 176-86.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 253

Two Gaelic variants of 'The Two Sisters' (Paul G. Brewster), pp. 187-92.

Shelley's use of Gray's poetry (Francis J. Glasheen), pp. 192-6.

Another reading of *The Turn of the Screw* (N. Bryllion Fagin), pp. 196-202.

Mechanical features of a seventeenth-century submarine (J. Louis Kuethe), pp. 202-4.

On Jonson's *Staple of News*.

Chaucer's two-mile pilgrimage (H. M. Smyser), pp. 205-7.

On *Hous of Fame*, 111-8.

The authorship of *Whitehall*, 1827 (Ralph M. Wardle), pp. 207-9.

On Lockhart's collaboration.

Nathanael Salmon on Milton, 1728 (Robert A. Aubin), pp. 214-5.

Housman's *More Poems*, vii and Dehmel's *Trost* (Everett Bushnell Gladding), pp. 215-7.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXXVI., No. 1, January 1941—

Geoffrey Chaucer, J.P. and M.P. (Margaret Galway), pp. 1-36.

The Faerie Queene: alterations and structure (J. H. Walter), pp. 37-58.

The sociological approach to literature (W. Witte), pp. 86-94.

Notes upon the text and interpretation of *Beowulf* (W. S. Mackie), pp. 95-8.

Shelley's translation of the *Ion* of Plato (James A. Notopoulos), pp. 98-105.

Additional Note, p. 155.

A note on Dr. Johnson and Sebastien Mercier (H. Saer), pp. 109-12.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 179, December 28, 1940—

Notes on Milton (E. H. Visiak), pp. 453-4.

Continued February 22, 1941, Vol. 180, pp. 133-4.

Notes on Pepys's Tangier Papers (Donald Dale), pp. 455-7.

Reply from C. Wanklyn, January 18, 1941, pp. 43-4.

Izaak Walton's 'Honest Nat. and R. Roe': Nathaniel Stringer (W. J. Carlton), p. 460.

— Vol. 180, January 4, 1941—

The authorship of the *Spanish Tragedy* additions (H. W. Crundell), pp. 8-9.

On Dekker's authorship.

— January 11—

Blackwood's Magazine, Lockhart, and John Scott: a Whig satirical broadside (Alan Lang Strout), pp. 22-4.

— January 18—

Dating and holograph evidence in *The Whore of Babylon* (W. H. Halstead), pp. 38-40.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 180, January 25—

Some Spenser problems (W. H. Weply), pp. 56-9.

Continued February 1, pp. 74-6; concluded February 8, pp. 92-5; replies from B. H. Newdigate and J. B. Whitmore, February 15, p. 120; reply from W. H. Weply, March 1, p. 151. Corrigenda and addenda from W. H. Weply, March 29, p. 224.

"Timothy Tickler" of *Blackwood's Magazine* (Alan Lang Strout), p. 61.

— February 8—

A note on *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, 877 (M. E. Richardson), pp. 96-7.

The likenesses of John Oldham (Donald Dale), pp. 97-8.

— February 15—

The characters in *Piers Plowman*: the Bishop of Bethlehem (M. E. Richardson), pp. 116-7.

— March 1—

Samuel Pepys and Tangier (Donald Dale), pp. 146-9.

— March 8—

Some Spenser problems (Douglas Hamer), pp. 165-7.

Continued March 15, pp. 183-4; March 22, pp. 206-9; March 29, pp. 220-4.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. XX., No. 1, January 1941—

De Quincey and *The Prelude* in 1839 (John Edwin Wells), pp. 1-24.

Interim etymologies: L (Harold Whitehall), pp. 25-37.

On the etymology of fifteen words with initial 'I'.

Defoe and the eighteenth-century pamphlets on London (John Robert Moore), pp. 38-45.

Melville's midwestern lecture tour, 1859 (Merrell R. Davis), pp. 46-57.

William Kenrick as translator and critic of Rousseau (Richard B. Sewall), pp. 58-68.

James Cooper and George Croghan (Andrew Nelson), pp. 69-73.

A folklore theme in the *King of Tars* (Lillian Herlands Hornstein), pp. 82-7.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXVIII., No. 1, January 1941—

The text of the *Canterbury Tales* (Robert K. Root), pp. 1-13.

Chaucer and the Breton Lays of the Auchinleck MS. (Laura Hibbard Loomis), pp. 14-33.

The date of the B-Text of *Piers Plowman* (Bernard F. Huppé), pp. 34-44.

The philosophic unity of More's *Utopia* (Robert P. Adams), pp. 45-65.

A new source for *Gulliver's Travels* (John Robert Moore), pp. 66-80.
Gulliver's Travels and the Voyages et aventures de Jacques Massé, 1710.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 255

The controversy over Southey's *Wat Tyler* (Frank Taliaferro Hoadley), pp. 81-96.

The source of the Jules-Phene episode in *Pippa Passes* (Frederic E. Faverty), pp. 97-105.

Browning's debt to Bulwer's play *The Lady of Lyons* and its source.

The political ideas of Theodore Parker (Arthur I. Ladu), pp. 106-23.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, December 28, 1940—

A note on the Hardys (St. John Ervine), p. 655.

— January 4, 1941—

Scott's Prologue to *Helga* (W. M. Parker), p. 12.

— January 18—

A line in Gabriel Harvey (T. W. Baldwin), p. 31.

On 'Weepe Powles, thy *Tamberlaine* voutsafes to dye'. Reply from F. S.

Boas, February 15, p. 79.

Faithful Teate: forgotten poet (Thomas Driberg), p. 36.

Continued January 25, p. 48.

— January 25—

The text of Trollope (R. W. Chapman), p. 48.

Correspondence, on Trollope's punctuation, from Simon Nowell-Smith,

February 8, p. 72; reply from R. W. Chapman, March 1, p. 108.

— February 1—

Gerard as a goblin name (Bruce Dickens), p. 55.

Further correspondence from W. C. Mackenzie and Bruce Dickens,

February 15, pp. 79, 81.

A passage in Gibbon (J. H. Vince), p. 55.

Washington Irving (Joseph C. Borden, Jr.), p. 55.

Request for information supplementary to the Bibliographies of Langfeld and Williams.

Ambrose Philips (Mary G. Segar), p. 60.

Concerning the *Cambridge Bibliography*; reply from F. W. Bateson,

February 22, p. 91; from Mary G. Segar, March 8, p. 117.

— February 8—

The *Cambridge Bibliography* (Alec Craig), p. 67.

Further correspondence from Michael Sadleir, March 1, p. 103; reply from

Alec Craig, March 15, p. 127.

Sir Gawain and the Green Knight (W. W. Greg), p. 67.

Mediaeval British Libraries (Neil R. Ker), p. 72.

Request for information concerning the present whereabouts of some sixty MSS.

— February 15—

Fuseli and Mary Wollstonecraft (Sydney Jeffery), p. 81.

— February 22—

Gibbon's syntax (E. Harrison), pp. 91, 94.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, March 1—

The game of ombre in the *Rape of the Lock* (F. W. Bateson), p. 108.

Reply from Dermot Morrah, March 8, pp. 115, 117; from Montague Summers, March 15, p. 127; from Geoffrey Tillotson, March 22, pp. 139, 140; from Dermot Morrah, March 29, pp. 151, 153.

— March 8—

Pope's 'lost' poems (Norman Ault), p. 115.

Enquiry concerning the whereabouts of thirteen 'lost' poems and request for the loan of Vol. 2, Pt. 1 of Dodsley's 1743 edition of the *Works*.

A line in Keats (C. Archer), p. 117.

On 'lords' ('hoards') in line 11 of the sonnet 'To Sleep'. Replies from Laurence Binyon, R. W. King and E. H. W. Meyerstein, March 29, p. 151.

'Father' and 'Mother' (R. W. Chapman), p. 117.

— March 22—

The Book of Margery Kempe (Hope Emily Allen), p. 139.

The Text of Trollope—II (R. W. Chapman), p. 144.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO QUARTERLY, Vol. X., No. 2, January 1941—

Henry James: the war chapter, 1914-1916 (Leon Edel), pp. 125-38.

The pattern of Milton's *Nativity Ode* (Arthur Barker), pp. 167-81.

